

00001

1 KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
2 ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

3

4 Millenium Hotel
5 Anchorage, Alaska
6 October 17, 2003
7 9:00 o'clock a.m.

8

9

10 COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

11

12 Della Trumble, Chairman

13 Alfred Cratty

14 Patrick Holmes

15 Ivan Lukin

16 Pete Squartsoff

17 Vincent Tutiakoff

18 Richard Zacharoff.

19

20 Regional Coordinator, Michelle Chivers

00002

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

P R O C E E D I N G S

(Anchorage, Alaska - 10/17/2003)

(On record)

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Could we have roll call.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Alfred Cratty.

MR. CRATTY: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Ivan Lukin.

MR. LUKIN: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vincent Tutiakoff.

MR. TUTIAKOFF: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff. Here. Patrick Holmes.

(No response - arrives later)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul Gunderson.

(No response)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon Simeonoff.

(No response)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Della Trumble.

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: John Foster.

(No response)

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Richard Zacharoff.

MR. ZACHAROFF: Here.

MR. SQUARTSOFF: Quorum is established.

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. You can turn on your mikes so he can record. What we have kind

00003

1 of decided to do at this point is to call the meeting to
2 order and then to reconvene at 11:00 o'clock so that we
3 can attend the Aleut Corporation's village seminar which
4 at 9:30 they have subsistence on their agenda and it will
5 be a good time for us to be able to listen to a larger
6 group of people from our region to find out if there's
7 any issues that we're not hearing about.

8

9 Do I hear a motion to reconvene until
10 11:00 o'clock.

11

12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So move.

13

14 MR. TUTIAKOFF: Second.

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pete
17 Squartsoff, second by Vincent Tutiakoff. All those in
18 favor signify by saying aye.

19

20 IN UNISON: Aye.

21

22 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: All those opposed
23 same sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. We
28 will be back at 11:00 o'clock.

29

30 (Off record)

31

32 (On record)

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The meeting back to
35 order. It is now close to about 11:00 o'clock. For the
36 record, Pat Holmes has joined us. At this time we will
37 review an adoption of the agenda. As we broke this
38 morning to attend the Aleut Corporation's village
39 workshop to find out whether or not there were issues of
40 concern in regard to subsistence and one of the issues I
41 think that did come up was the sea otter, so we need to
42 add that into our agenda. I'm not sure where. Maybe
43 under 13, addition of other new business.

44

45 The other issue that was discussed that
46 we would like to address and maybe Tom can help us with
47 this or Tim is one of our Council members has missed
48 quite a number of meetings and, as we call for roll call,
49 given what their circumstances are that they are not
50 available, whether they've got an excused absence or

00004

1 unexcused absence, we may want to go back to that roll
2 call. I guess it's two at this point, is that correct?
3 Three, Speridon, Paul and John, whether we received any
4 information from them whether their absence is excused or
5 unexcused. Are there any other items?

6

7 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. We do have
8 one addition. Steve Schrof will be giving a
9 presentation. He said it's about a five, ten-minute
10 presentation, and his report does fall under D, other
11 written reports, and he has the Afognak Lake Smolt
12 Enumeration Project, which is in the book, but he's going
13 to be giving an update.

14

15 Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Any other items.

18

19 (No comment)

20

21 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Hearing none.
22 Election of officers. I think earlier we discussed that
23 we will move that to our spring meeting in Kodiak and
24 hopefully have not only who's confirmed as Council
25 members, but also -- move the election of officers to our
26 spring meeting in Kodiak. There are no other items. Do
27 I hear a motion to accept the agenda as amended?

28

29 MR. CRATTY: Make a motion to accept the
30 agenda as amended.

31

32 MR. LUKIN: Second.

33

34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Al
35 Cratty. Second by Ivan Lukin. Discussion. Call for
36 question. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

37

38 IN UNISON: Aye.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

41

42 (No opposing votes)

43

44 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.
45 Michelle, if we can go back to whether you've heard from
46 Paul Gunderson or the three Council members and the
47 status of their absence.

48

49 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. Paul
50 Gunderson is apparently in Nelson Lagoon. He had a

00005

1 project that came up. Everything that he needed for his
2 project arrived September 15th and he had stated he would
3 not make the last meeting as well that was scheduled for
4 September 17th. He is still currently working on that
5 project and called ahead of time to let us know that he
6 would not be making the meeting. In terms of Speridon
7 Simeonoff, he is at his annual corporation meeting,
8 Akhiok Corporation meeting, and he did call in advance.
9 As for John Foster, I was unable to get a hold of him to
10 not only inform him of the meeting, but to see if he
11 would be attending the meeting. So he is unexcused. The
12 other two are excused.

13

14 Thank you.

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: If we could have a
17 motion at this time to accept the absence of Paul
18 Gunderson and Speridon Simeonoff and then I think we need
19 to have a discussion on John Foster's absence.

20

21 MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty here. I'd like to
22 withdraw John Foster's seat and move Richard Zacharof
23 into his position and look for another alternate.

24

25 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. At this
26 point, the only thing we can really do is make a
27 recommendation that John Foster be removed. The
28 nominations will actually be made by the Secretary of the
29 Interior, so that's not up to us to do. So if you just
30 want to stay with the removal of John Foster, we can do
31 that at this point.

32

33 Thank you.

34

35 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll make the motion to
36 accept Paul Gunderson and Speridon Simeonoff.

37

38 MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

39

40 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The motion made by
41 Peter Squartsoff. A second by Richard Zacharof.
42 Discussion. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

43

44 IN UNISON: Aye.

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

47

48 (No opposing votes)

49

50 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. If

00006

1 I may just kind of go off the agenda just a little bit at
2 this point. We need to probably do introductions. We
3 didn't do that this morning. Not everybody was here and
4 we kind of ran out of the room. If we can start with Pat
5 and go around and then Staff.

6

7 MR. HOLMES: I'm Pat Holmes from the road
8 system of Kodiak and kind of had a long drive yesterday
9 and today, so if I get kind of crazy, I'd like Richard to
10 just grab my beard and give it a jerk. The solid stuff
11 in the coffee cup and in the bag back there is solid
12 subsistence food. It's a favorite of a friend of mine,
13 Moses Dirk, so I didn't have any time to bring any
14 pickled herring this time.

15

16 MR. ZACHAROF: Richard Zacharof from St.
17 Paul.

18

19 MR. LUKIN: Ivan Lukin from Port Lions.

20

21 MR. CRATTY: Al Cratty from Old Harbor.

22

23 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff, Port
24 Lions.

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Della Trumble from
27 King Cove.

28

29 MS. CHIVERS: Michelle Chivers, Council
30 coordinator.

31

32 MR. FISHER: Dave Fisher, Fish and
33 Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management,
34 Anchorage.

35

36 (Cannot hear Staff's introductions
37 because not speaking into microphone)

38

39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you and
40 welcome everyone. I believe the next item on our agenda
41 is review and adoption of minutes of March 19th and 20th,
42 2003 in Kodiak.

43

44 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I move to
45 adopt.

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: A motion by Pat
48 Holmes to adopt the minutes of March 19th and 20th. Do I
49 hear a second?

50

00007

1 MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Richard
4 Zacharof. Discussion. Hearing none. All those in favor
5 signify by saying aye.

6

7 IN UNISON: Aye.

8

9 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

10

11 (No opposing votes)

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.
14 Next item on the agenda is Chair's report, Federal Board
15 meeting, May 2003. To be really honest with you, it's
16 been a while back and I don't even remember what
17 happened. Is it in here, Michelle?

18

19 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair, at the back
20 of Tab A, the last few pages, is actually the 805(c)
21 letter, which is the letter to the Council stating the
22 actions taken by the Federal Subsistence Board at that
23 meeting.

24

25 Thank you.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Michelle.
28 I feel like I've been on a meeting marathon. So there is
29 a letter, page 35, for your review. At this point I'd
30 just ask if there's any questions or if there's anyone
31 that wants to add to this that they may at this time.
32 I'm going to go ahead at this time and add two other
33 meetings to this and that would be the Tri-Council
34 meeting that I attended up in Wasilla and then we just
35 attended the Aleut Corporation's village meeting, which
36 the first item on their agenda this morning was
37 subsistence.

38

39 I had the opportunity to spend two days
40 at the Tri-Council meeting of the Western Interior,
41 Eastern Interior and Yukon-Kuskokwim and I'll have to say
42 that each time I attend these meetings I really learn a
43 lot more about some of the issues that evolve around the
44 three Councils and the river system. I think I was
45 really pleased that they took heart, I think, not only to
46 try to make an effort to respectfully work amongst each
47 other because they are three regions that do have
48 conflicting issues amongst not only themselves, but of
49 course the other one is with Area M. I felt good that
50 they had made that effort and given that there were

00008

1 issues of controversy, that they made an effort to work
2 together really well.

3

4 Some of the issues that are overlapping
5 and it was interesting to see that some of the issues of
6 maybe like the Eastern Council wanting the Western
7 Council not to have commercial fisheries and some of the
8 limits and things on subsistence itself. Many of you are
9 aware that they did have a good season this year. They
10 did have more fish, I think, than they anticipated, but
11 they also, I believe, just because I do get reports from
12 the various agencies as they come out and to see the
13 efforts that are being made not only by Fish and Wildlife
14 and ADF&G, the various Native groups in the region and
15 the councils that are working and coordinating closely
16 together on monitoring when the subsistence openings will
17 happen and the commercial openings and, correct me if I'm
18 wrong on this, some of the sports. I think their efforts
19 in the last few years of doing that, I honestly believe
20 the outcome of it has been that they were able to have
21 the fish that they have this year and hopefully, as this
22 continues, that they will see the fruits of their effort.

23

24

25 It is hard, in my understanding of
26 talking to a lot of their people, just having the windows
27 and having the closure, having the enforcement or the
28 regulations put in place. It's hard. For years they
29 have just utilized these resources and having to do some
30 of these things and abiding by regulations, it's still
31 hard for them. I think they understand the reasoning for
32 the effort now and the fruits of those.

33

34 I've also asked them, as they are in
35 YRDFA meetings the next couple days, if they do and can
36 break away from their meetings to be able to attend this
37 meeting and it would be nice for a lot of you to meet
38 some of them face to face. One of the things I find, and
39 it was brought to my attention, is I've been able to
40 attend a couple of their meetings, so they know my face,
41 but they don't necessarily know the faces of this Council
42 and people in our region and what our issues are. I
43 think, as we educate each other and ourselves and better
44 understand, that we try to work together as user groups
45 and regions, but also not to pit one group or region
46 against each other because it doesn't solve anything. I
47 think the better efforts come from trying to work
48 together and understanding each other.

49

50 With that, does anybody have any

00009

1 questions in regard to that or have I left anything out?

2

3 (No comment)

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You guys are just
6 way too easy. Pat.

7

8 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Pat Holmes.
9 It might be interesting for folks who didn't make the
10 Aleut Corporation's subsistence meeting if you could
11 maybe put a couple highlights on the record.

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I'm glad that we
14 were able to take the opportunity to go over this morning
15 and attend the Aleut Corporation's village seminar, which
16 the first item on their agenda was subsistence this
17 morning. There's very few times we have an opportunity
18 to get into such a large group and representation from
19 all the communities in the region. Stanley Mack was
20 there to talk a little bit about migratory birds. Vince
21 talked about some of the projects that are in place,
22 Mortensons, McLees Lake and some of those. I talked to
23 some about the TEK and how important it is that they try
24 to cooperate with people so we get some information to
25 prove that we actually do subsist.

26

27 One of the big issues that did come out
28 of that was the concern in regard to the sea otters. If
29 you look back into the minutes, you'll see that that
30 concern also was brought up in Kodiak last spring meeting
31 because of people subsisting from clams and the effect
32 that sea otters have on the various clam beds in our
33 region and I think a gentleman from Atka did speak
34 strongly about the sea otters and the clam beds and I
35 believe also Unalaska. The other thing is a concern that
36 it is, I believe, listed as critical habitat at this
37 point and the concern that it does go to endangered
38 species and hopefully there is a better public process.
39 There was also questions on how the management plans are
40 being put into place.

41

42 Glenn, is there anything else you can
43 think of in regard to that? Ivan.

44

45 MR. LUKIN: A concern that I heard is
46 that once a species goes on the endangered species list,
47 it's forgotten and it's not dealt with.

48

49 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

50

00010

1 MR. HOLMES: One of the things in the
2 times that I've spent at Atka is that folks had noticed
3 that the otter populations have come up and down more
4 than once in recent life spans of folks and not only the
5 problem of depletion of the subsistence clam beds, but
6 also I think it's important to note on the record that in
7 the early '90s they were having problems getting sea
8 urchins, which are quite an important subsistence
9 delicacy and there were only a few places that they could
10 get those. Recently, since the sea otter populations
11 have declined, the urchin beds have improved quite a bit
12 for the folks that utilize that resource, so there's a
13 strong intertie, I think, in those villages of Atka, as
14 well as Nikolski and Unalaska. I would also have
15 concerns on the critical habitat, what does that mean,
16 and when are things reviewed and how that affects other
17 fisheries and other subsistence uses.

18

19 Thank you, ma'am.

20

21 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. And
22 we did add that to our agenda, so hopefully someone is
23 going to be able to help us with that later in the day,
24 some of our questions. It was also brought to my
25 attention that another concern was the closing of fishing
26 areas and the effect that Stellar sea lion and Stellar
27 eider have had on our region in regard to that. I don't
28 know if there's someone that's going to be able to help
29 us with some of these questions or answers, as we have
30 added another business on our agenda later in the day.

31

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair. Pete
33 Squartsoff. One thing we didn't mention was Vincent
34 mentioned about a bunch of people being dropped off on
35 different islands out there to survey the sea otter and
36 he said that should be coming out in January.

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Are
39 there any other Council member reports?

40

41 (No comment)

42

43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We've moved election
44 of officers until our next meeting. I guess at this time
45 we are at Caribou, Unit 9(D) and 10, request for
46 temporary action.

47

48 Dave Fisher.

49

50 MR. FISHER: Thank you, Madame Chair. I

00011

1 have some maps and a wildlife proposal to hand out before
2 I start. Madame Chair, my presentation will be pretty
3 short. I'm going to talk about the Southern Alaska
4 Peninsula Caribou Herd.

5

6 As we all know, the population has
7 fluctuated over the years. It declined in the early '80s
8 from a population of up around 10,000 down to around
9 4,000 in '89. Around 1995, '96, the population was
10 estimated to be about 1,800. This prompted a series of
11 hunting closures. Federal lands were closed to
12 non-qualified hunters in '91. The Board of Game and the
13 Federal Subsistence Board closed all lands in '93. The
14 population started to rebound and in '97 the hunting
15 resumed and since then it's been managed by some special
16 actions and also some regulatory proposals.

17

18 Surveys conducted last winter by the
19 Izembek Wildlife Refuge and the Department of Game
20 indicated that the herd had grown and harvest limits for
21 subsistence users could be increased. However, this
22 information wasn't available for our last meeting in
23 order to submit a proposal for the next regulatory cycle.
24 That is one of the handouts and I'll discuss that in just
25 a little bit.

26

27 The winter surveys that were conducted
28 last winter indicated a population of around 4,100 in
29 Unit 9(D) and around 1,260 on Unimak Island. This
30 population is slightly above the management plan
31 objective of maintaining the population of four to five
32 thousand, so the population is stable and we're in pretty
33 good shape.

34

35 As a result of this increase, the
36 Kodiak/Aleutians Council submitted a special action that
37 would increase the harvest limit in '90 from one to two
38 and from two to four on Unimak Island. This special
39 action was approved by the Board last July. However, the
40 special action is only good for 60 days, so that special
41 action expired at the end of that fall season. A
42 temporary action is needed to extend that increase in
43 harvest limit through the winter and fall season and
44 that's what we're talking about here. This is Temporary
45 Special Action 03-10.

46

47 As I stated, this special action would
48 extend the harvest limit for the winter and spring hunt.
49 It would allow subsistence hunters the opportunity to
50 harvest additional animals. A potential harvest increase

00012

1 should help stabilize the current population in line with
2 a current carrying capacity and the existence of habitat
3 for this herd should help us stay within that management
4 plan guidelines.

5
6 I did hand out a wildlife proposal and
7 all that would do would make the special action and the
8 temporary special action, make that a permanent
9 regulation, so you can look that over and if you have any
10 comments on it, you can make those. But that's basically
11 all I have.

12
13 Thank you, Madame Chair.

14
15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Dave.
16 Alaska Department of Fish and Game comments.

17
18 (No comment)

19
20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I didn't see
21 anything in the book either. Other agency comments.

22
23 (No comment)

24
25 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Fish and Game
26 Advisory Committee comments.

27
28 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. The Fish and
29 Game Advisory Committee won't meet until next week for
30 discussion. I can give you a guess if you'd like. I
31 would suspect that the Kodiak one probably wouldn't have
32 much difficulty with that. Would you, Pete?

33
34 MR. SQUARTSOFF: No.

35
36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Summary
37 of written public comments.

38
39 MS. CHIVERS: Thank you, Madame Chair.
40 There are no written public comments.

41
42 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Public testimony.
43 I'm just going to say a few words. When Dave had this
44 put together, I did post it around the communities, I did
45 fax it to all the tribal offices in our region that this
46 would affect -- the communities that it would affect, and
47 I didn't hear any comments from the other communities. I
48 did talk to people from Sand Point or King Cove or False
49 Pass and they all supported it. I realized nobody signed
50 up for any public testimony. Sometimes when you don't

00013

1 have any comments, I'm assuming we're all headed in the
2 right direction at this point. Regional Council
3 deliberation, recommendation and justification.

4

5 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I support this extension
6 from two to four and from one to two for the caribou in
7 9(D) and 10.

8

9 MR. CRATTY: This is Al. I support it
10 also.

11

12 MR. LUKIN: My name is Ivan. I support
13 it also.

14

15 MR. ZACHAROF: Richard Zacharof. I
16 support it.

17

18 MR. HOLMES: I do, too. Do we need a
19 motion to adopt, Madame Chair, before we discuss? I'd
20 like to move that we adopt this and accept all the
21 comments retroactively.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pat
24 Holmes. Do I hear a second?

25

26 MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Richard
29 Zacharof. Discussion.

30

31 MR. HOLMES: I have one question for
32 Dave. What's the desired population? You said it was up
33 to 1,200 on Unimak. I noticed that you have a
34 Cooperative Management Agreement between ADF&G and the
35 Service for a goal of four to five thousand animals. Is
36 that total for the peninsula and Unimak? And is 1,200
37 animals too many? So this is perhaps being a preemptive
38 action on a positive thing biologically as well as a
39 subsistence thing? Is my assumption correct?

40

41 MR. FISHER: That is a management for
42 both areas. I'm not quite sure. I'd have to have some
43 help from Rick as far as what they anticipate the
44 carrying capacity for Unimak Island is.

45

46 MR. POETTER: If I can help on that.
47 Rick Poetter with Izembek NWR. Conversations with the
48 former Fish and Game biologist Dick Sellers, that area
49 was inclusive in that original plan. We've had some
50 discussions with him to try and come up with a division

00014

1 of that. They're the same animal herd, but we'd like to
2 consider them as sort of a sub unit because it is
3 somewhat isolated and they do sort of tend to stay on the
4 island for the most part. The answer is, yes, most
5 people feel that the numbers are significantly higher
6 than what they are on the peninsula, so to speak. In
7 other words, 1,200 on that portion of the land compared
8 to the rest of the peninsula, that's a fair number of
9 them on there and I'm in agreement with trying to take as
10 many off there as we can so that it doesn't crash.

11

12 MR. HOLMES: So I guess to recapitulate
13 what you're saying and my guess is that the density of
14 the caribou on Unimak Island, best scientific wildlife
15 guess, is a little too dense and they could use some
16 culling and that this management proposal would hope to
17 achieve reducing those numbers. I've been there when the
18 numbers were high and then things crash, so 1,200 on that
19 as compared to the rest of the peninsula is a fairly
20 dense population for the amount of habitat, at least the
21 areas I've been ashore on.

22

23 Thank you.

24

25 MR. POETTER: That's correct. And we
26 don't have any current habitat monitoring to give us some
27 real true guidelines. That's a need from our agency for
28 sure.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any other
31 questions for Rick at this time? Thank you, Rick. Any
32 other questions? What is the process now, again, Dave,
33 for -- you mentioned this will take us all the way
34 through March or is this just the fall?

35

36 MR. FISHER: Madame Chair. This will
37 take us through November 15th through March 31st season.
38 Two caribou for 9(D) and four caribou for Unimak Island.
39 After that we'll need a proposal to make that a permanent
40 regulation. That's what I've handed out. I've drafted
41 up a proposal for you to look at. All that does is, what
42 we're talking, make that a permanent regulation, two
43 caribou for 9(D) and four caribou for Unimak Island.

44

45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I don't know what
46 the process is.

47

48 MR. FISHER: You will submit this
49 proposal as coming from the Council. It will just fall
50 in line with the normal wildlife proposal process that we

00015

1 use and next year the regulation will be a permanent
2 regulation, two caribou for 9(D) and four caribou for
3 Unimak Island. That's not precluding something
4 drastically happening and we would need a special action
5 to make that correction.

6

7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Dave. I
8 do want to make a comment in regard to this. When we got
9 the permits, it was really confusing because we hadn't
10 taken this action. It is after the fact to some degree.
11 I know those permits are processed out of our office, but
12 people weren't sure if they got one caribou could they
13 come back for another permit or were they able to just
14 get the two caribou at the time that they were applying
15 for their subsistence permit.

16

17 MR. POETTER: Rick Poetter again. The
18 way I understood those permits, because we didn't have
19 the second special action in place, the permits were
20 issued with the intent that if it did, they would
21 continue onward. So those permits at that point in time
22 were good for two animals on 9(D) and four on Unimak.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We tried to figure
25 out whether or not someone can go out and get the two
26 caribou or whether they have to come back and get another
27 one and there was a note pending the special action.

28

29 MR. POETTER: I believe for 9(D) when
30 they came in they would get two actual copies. It was
31 one of two, two of two. For Unimak, they'd get one of
32 four, two of four, three of four, four of four. So they
33 would have all of those and they would be invalid if this
34 does not pass. I know it's confusing, but it was really
35 hard to -- it's a very complicated deal and it was hard
36 to work that out.

37

38 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So we'll leave that
39 job to you if this doesn't pass to go pick them up, the
40 ones I handed out.

41

42 MR. FISHER: Madame Chair. Just a short
43 word. It was confusing and that was sort of the
44 recommendation that was given to us by our permit person
45 to try and cover all the bases. I guess we'd kind of
46 forgotten that the special action was only good for 60
47 days, so we had to regroup and what we saw was the end
48 result, so I do apologize for the confusion. Hopefully
49 now we'll get a permanent regulation and we won't have
50 that again.

00016

1 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Now I have a question.
2 When we do take this special action, who determines when
3 it goes into effect? Does it go into effect immediately
4 because we're just an advisory board?

5
6 MR. FISHER: The temporary action that
7 you're going to act on today will be discussed by the
8 Staff Committee and your recommendation and their
9 recommendation will be forwarded to the Board. There
10 really shouldn't be any problem. I don't see any problem
11 and it should sail right through, pretty simple.

12
13 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Just for future
14 reference. If it's passed, then how long does it take to
15 become legal to harvest?

16
17 MR. FISHER: The Staff Committee is going
18 to meet, I think, next week, Tuesday, and they'll discuss
19 it and then they'll forward it to the Board. I think
20 what they're going to do is have a telephone roll call
21 vote, so it will be in effect shortly, within two or
22 three days, after that.

23
24 Tom Boyd, have I covered it pretty good?

25
26 MR. BOYD: You've covered it.

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. Are there any
29 other questions or discussion? We have a motion on the
30 floor and it's been seconded.

31
32 MR. HOLMES: Question.

33
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The question has
35 been called. All in favor signify by saying aye.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

40
41 (No opposing votes)

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.
44 Okay. Call for proposals to change Federal subsistence
45 wildlife regulations. I believe we have a copy of that
46 that Dave dropped in front of us. Dave.

47
48 MR. FISHER: Before you is the proposal
49 to make the special action and temporary special action a
50 permanent regulation and I drafted that up for approval

00017

1 by the Council and we'll go ahead and submit it with our
2 other wildlife proposals for the upcoming regulatory
3 years.

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Discussion on this.
6 Do I hear a motion to accept the proposal?

7

8 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I'll make a motion to
9 accept.

10

11 MR. HOLMES: I'll second.

12

13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion has been made
14 and second. Discussion.

15

16 (No comment)

17

18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Call for question.
19 All those in favor signify by saying aye.

20

21 IN UNISON: Aye.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

24

25 (No opposing votes)

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. At
28 this time I'm going to ask -- Tom, are you going to be
29 available all day or are you only going to be here for
30 part of the day?

31

32 MR. BOYD: Madame Chair. Tom Boyd. I
33 will be available to you all day if you'd like.

34

35 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: My reason for asking
36 is in regard to the funding issue between -- we've got
37 Western Alaska complies to Bristol Bay and
38 Kodiak/Aleutians and I'm assuming that will come up on
39 our agenda under this fisheries information program, so
40 we'll pick it up later.

41

42 MR. BOYD: That will be fine, Madame
43 Chair.

44

45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. I think
46 at this time we're going to go ahead and break for lunch.
47 I wanted to talk a little bit with Tom about a couple
48 things and then I'd also, while we're here, like to talk
49 with Rick. So if we could break for lunch and then come
50 back at 1:00 o'clock. I don't see that we're going to be

00018

1 longer than a couple more hours on this. It should go
2 fairly fast.

3

4 (Off record)

5

6 (On record)

7

8 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. We can
9 reconvene. The next item on our agenda is No. 11, Tab C,
10 Fisheries Information Services Program. Steve Fried

11

12 MR. FRIED: Good afternoon. Steve Fried
13 from the Office of Subsistence Management. All the
14 information that I will talk about for the most part is
15 under Tab C. I've also got some handouts and we can get
16 to those later.

17

18 The first thing I'd like to bring to your
19 attention is the 2004 Fisheries Resources Monitoring
20 Plan. The purpose of the program is to fund technically
21 sound projects that address the highest priority
22 subsistence fishery issues and have broad public support.
23 The Council needs to take action and select the projects
24 they wish to see included in the final 2004 plan.

25

26 The Technical Review Committee has
27 already made recommendations on the projects they think
28 should be included in the plan and the Federal
29 Subsistence Board will consider all these recommendations
30 from the Technical Review Committee, the Councils and the
31 public and other agencies when they adopt the final plan
32 either during their December 2003 or January 2004
33 meeting.

34

35 Just by way of introduction and give a
36 little overview of the plan, under Tab C, it starts on
37 page 49. I'm not going to go through the whole thing,
38 but if you want to take a look at the map on page 53 it
39 shows that there's six study readings within the state
40 for this program. Kodiak/Aleutians has been grouped with
41 Bristol Bay/Alaska Peninsula as a single study region.

42

43 The total amount of funds available for
44 all projects in 2004 is approximately \$6.1 million.
45 There's a table on the bottom of page 53 and you can see
46 the totals and amounts by region that's available for
47 2004 funding. Not all the funding -- actually, every
48 year there's like \$7.25 million, but not all the funding
49 goes towards new projects because some of the funds are
50 used to continue projects that were funded in prior years

00019

1 and also for the Partner's Program. In 2004, this
2 consists of about \$1.1 million of additional funding, so
3 that 6.1 is what's available for new programs and 2004
4 there's an additional 1.1 that's being used to fund
5 continuing projects in the Partner's Program.

6

7 Out of the 2004 project funds, 11.7
8 percent of this is for this study region, which is about
9 \$716,000. For 2004, we've got 81 projects that were
10 considered for funding within the state and out of these
11 81, 12 are within this region. There's a table on page
12 57 that gives a breakdown of the number of investigation
13 plans for the studies by region and by information type.

14

15 The Technical Review Committee, which
16 consists of members of the five Federal agencies, three
17 members from the Department of Fish and Game and this
18 year we also had two partner positions serve on the
19 Technical Review Committee, made their recommendation
20 based on four ranking factors. These are strategic
21 priority of the study, the scientific merit of the study,
22 the past performance administrative expertise of the
23 applicant and their organization or agency. Also the
24 partnership capacity building component of the study.
25 Based on the review, the Technical Review Committee
26 recommended funding 64 of the 81 projects and, of these,
27 nine of the 12 for this region are within
28 Kodiak/Aleutians. So there's nine Kodiak/Aleutians
29 studies that TRC recommended for funding.

30

31 The total cost for all these projects,
32 which you can see on Table 3 on page 58, is \$5.7 million,
33 which is actually about \$400,000 less than the total
34 available. Assuming this is what ends up being funded,
35 what happens with this \$400,000, there are always some
36 increased costs that occur when there's modifications to
37 investigation plans and also any remaining funds are used
38 to fund like the year two of a multi-year study and that
39 frees up funds in 2005 for more new studies, so it's not
40 that the money is going to go away.

41

42 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Can I interrupt you for
43 a second. You said nine for Kodiak/Aleutians, but it
44 says Bristol Bay/Kodiak/Aleutians.

45

46 MR. FRIED: Actually, there's 12 total.
47 There's nine -- oh, you're right, there's nine total.

48

49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: But you said nine total
50 for Kodiak/Aleutian, but that includes Bristol Bay.

00020

1 MR. FRIED: Right, it does. I meant to
2 say there were 12 -- right. The recommendation was to
3 fund nine, but there's a total of 12, you're correct.

4
5 Okay. As far as projects go, the first
6 thing in your books would be the inter-regional projects,
7 which cover either statewide concerns or several regions.
8 There's five percent of the funding that's usually used
9 for inter-regional studies based on the Board guidelines.
10 For 2004, that would mean a little over \$300,000 for
11 inter-regional studies would be available.

12
13 There were a total of three inter-
14 regional projects that were considered for funding in
15 2004. One of them would involve this region. That would
16 be Project 04-751. There's a Table on page 61 that shows
17 the three projects. There's also descriptions of each
18 project beginning on page 65. For study 04-751, the
19 description would be on page 73. That's basically a
20 statewide Subsistence Harvest Database Update and Report
21 Preparation. It's actually a continuation of some work
22 that's been funded prior to this. Besides updating the
23 database, the newest thing for this would be including
24 non-salmon fin fish and marine invertebrates in the
25 database. Right now it's generally a salmon subsistence
26 database.

27
28 There would be information in this
29 database from this region. The other two studies really
30 don't have anything to do with Kodiak/Aleutians. There's
31 one on Eulachon for Southeast and Southcentral. The
32 other one is a database for Arctic/Yukon-Kuskokwim. So
33 out of the three inter-regional studies, this would be
34 the one that would have some use for this area.

35
36 The Technical Review Committee actually
37 recommended funding all three of these projects. The
38 total cost of that in 2004 would be \$177,000, which is
39 \$130,000 less than the total available. As I mentioned
40 before, those funds would be used within the program and
41 in other ways.

42
43 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Can you elaborate on
44 what the other ways would be?

45
46 MR. FRIED: I mentioned it before that a
47 lot of times a lot of these studies are recommended for
48 funding with modifications and sometimes those
49 modifications actually cost more money than was
50 originally requested and the other way usually is to fund

00021

1 a second year of a multi-year study so it will be funded
2 through 2004 funds and not 2005 funds. It actually frees
3 up future money instead of tying it up in continuing
4 studies.

5

6 I guess a third way would be using it to
7 fund some important study in another region and that
8 would be something that would be decided or recommended
9 by the Staff committee and the Board would make that kind
10 of decision.

11

12 If there's any questions about these
13 inter-regional studies, I'd be happy to answer them.
14 Other than that, it would be good for the Council to take
15 a look at these, maybe discuss them and decide whether or
16 not they approve the TRC recommendation to fund all three
17 or if you another set of recommendations.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Steve, looking at
20 this handout.....

21

22 MR. FRIED: Right. I was going to get to
23 that. We can do that now. It was a request from Pat
24 Holmes for information, so I put that together.

25

26 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I had some questions
27 on that. Maybe we should discuss that before we go
28 accepting any of the recommended -- maybe looking at this
29 one before we go taking any action on approving or
30 disapproving or amending what's been presented.

31

32 MR. FRIED: There's a handout, it's two
33 pages, has a bar graph on one side and a list of projects
34 on the other one. Pat Holmes had asked if I could
35 provide information on the breakdown of funding between
36 Bristol Bay/Alaska Peninsula and the Kodiak/Aleutians
37 area through the history of this program. The table
38 lists the projects that have been funded and it also
39 includes the 2004 studies that have been recommended for
40 funding but haven't been funded yet. Then I graphed the
41 total amount of money that would cost to fund all these
42 projects.

43

44 I guess the thing to look at is that at
45 the beginning of the program in 2000, Bristol Bay did
46 receive quite a bit more money than Kodiak/Aleutians, but
47 by 2003 it actually has more or less tended to equal out.
48 2003 really is the last year we've got projects funded
49 and these other years, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2004 would
50 include the TRC-recommended studies and these are really

00022

1 just continuing expenses from studies that were funded in
2 prior years. So it looks like if 2003 and what's going
3 on in 2004 are any indication that the funding seems to
4 have leveled off between these two areas.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Looking at this
7 study, and I know these are just projected when you're
8 looking at the 2004 and continuing on to 2005 and 2006, I
9 recall when we went into this, like for the Buskin River,
10 McLees Lake and Mortensens Creek, that we were talking
11 about a three-year period for these studies, why would we
12 want to extend them on beyond a few years.

13

14 MR. FRIED: Three years was adopted.
15 It's kind of just a general. A lot of funding programs
16 have a set number of years where they first provide
17 funding up to three years or so. They don't want to
18 provide funding for too long a time period because they
19 want some time to be able to see whether or not the
20 project is useful to be able to evaluate it.

21

22 For studies like Buskin and McLees, the
23 investigators came back and were asking for more money,
24 one, because -- say for Buskin. Buskin funds two weirs
25 on the river and it's the only sockeye salmon escapement
26 estimate for that system. So, without that project there
27 really isn't a way to estimate what the spawning
28 escapement is on the Buskin. So that's fairly important
29 for not only subsistence management but fisheries
30 management in general. So it's an important management
31 tool.

32

33 The other thing is, if you're trying to
34 get an idea of salmon production, three years of
35 information does give you three years of spawning
36 escapement, but it doesn't really tell you what is
37 produced from those spawners. For sockeye, for example,
38 they come back as four, five and six year olds, so you
39 really need other information to get an idea of what's
40 produced from each spawning escapement.

41

42 So some projects are useful for a longer
43 term than three years and some aren't. I mean in some
44 places I guess you could argue that maybe three years of
45 escapement would be enough for a while if the harvest
46 isn't very large and you're not concerned about that
47 stock and maybe you'd get three years of information and
48 come back after maybe three, four, five years and take
49 another look. So it just depends on the project.

50

00023

1 The investigators for these thought that
2 it was important to at least get some full information on
3 some of the brood years to get an idea of production.
4 Like I said, for Buskin in particular, that's the only
5 program that provides spawning information.

6
7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, you might feel
8 that Buskin is really critical that that one definitely
9 continues on.

10
11 MR. HOLMES: Thanks for putting this
12 together, Steve. It helps give a person an idea of where
13 the funds are going. I assume on this bar graph that you
14 gave us that these are -- I guess I have a question. Are
15 these funds that originated in each of these years or is
16 this total amount that's being spent with carryover from
17 prior years?

18
19 MR. FRIED: That's a good question. It's
20 the total amount and includes the carryover from prior
21 years, so it's not just the funding for new studies. If
22 you went back to the table, it would be the annual totals
23 for each one that were graphed.

24
25 MR. HOLMES: I think that the Buskin is
26 certainly our biggest used area for subsistence in the
27 whole region and then followed by Afognak and I think the
28 work that's been done at McLees was something that I had
29 wanted to see funded a long time ago and really all three
30 of those areas have come up with some really good
31 information and I think the funding of this work on the
32 Buskin has also provided Fish and Game the ability to
33 take a broader look at it and they're finding a larger
34 component than they expected from a couple feeder lakes
35 on the Buskin system than they had ever expected from
36 taking a look at this. So this is very important within
37 the region, those three systems. Is this the point to
38 ask questions about what wasn't funded or we'll do that a
39 little bit later?

40
41 MR. FRIED: I guess the Council can
42 decide how they want to handle this. Basically, what I'd
43 like to see when we're all done is a recommendation on
44 inter-regional studies and also on the studies within the
45 Council's own area.

46
47 MR. HOLMES: So probably we'll need to go
48 through your pitch so we know what the inter-regional
49 discussions are.

50

00024

1 MR. FRIED: Unless you want to take
2 inter-regional after the area studies. We can do that,
3 too. It's up to the Council.

4
5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Maybe, Steve, let's
6 try this. It's pretty fairly well outlined or diagramed
7 here on what's being spent in which region that's
8 labelled Western Region, which includes Kodiak/Aleutians
9 and Bristol Bay. When I look at all this, there's two
10 issues that cross my mind. Number one, is the request to
11 have this funding split with the two regions,
12 Kodiak/Aleutians and Bristol Bay? The other piece of it
13 is the idea that when you look at Afognak Lake sockeye
14 salmon and the proposed budget for 2004, which doesn't
15 include it.

16
17 Now, is it my understanding when we're
18 looking at these and going through them that if we felt
19 that Afognak Lake needed to be reconsidered more
20 seriously and the reasons why, would that funding have to
21 be somehow -- would we have to delete one of these other
22 projects in order to compensate for that?

23
24 I guess there is a third one. When I
25 look at Mortensens or some of these other ones, I know we
26 looked at Mortensen's, one of the reasons was the
27 conflict because of the user groups and trying to get
28 more information and that is going on into what looks
29 like -- oh, what is it, the third year or fourth year?

30
31 MR. FRIED: This would be the third year.
32 It would end in 2003 unless more funding was provided.

33
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Maybe if we back up
35 at this point and let's talk about this funding
36 possibility of splitting and talk about what has been
37 presented to us to accept and, two, decide going from one
38 to possibly six, what's more important. Do you want to
39 try that? With that, maybe I'd ask Steve if you could
40 stay, but I'd also like to ask Tom Boyd to come up and
41 talk a little bit about the funding issue on these
42 studies between the two regions.

43
44 MR. BOYD: Madame Chair. Do you want me
45 to do that now or do you want to -- you said several
46 things, so I'm trying to understand.

47
48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I'm thinking if we
49 did it now because this schedule does kind of show that
50 funding is, as much as possible, being evened out and

00025

1 what we could possibly do because this isn't the first
2 time this issue came up. And then looking at the funding
3 that we have for 2004, what is the recommendation.

4

5 MR. BOYD: I'm going to try to understand
6 the issue. It's up to you to see if I'm addressing the
7 right issue. As I understand it, based on our previous
8 discussions, Madame Chair, the issue is a combination of
9 funding guidelines, combining the funding guidelines. Is
10 the fact that we've combined Kodiak/Aleutians and Bristol
11 Bay under the same funding guideline, is that the issue
12 you want to address?

13

14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

15

16 MR. BOYD: I'm will generally talk about
17 it, but I'm going to rely on Staff, Steve primarily, to
18 fill in some of the blanks. In general, funding
19 guidelines not only for this region, for all regions, are
20 just that, are guidelines. They're not hard and fast
21 like some might look at these. They're simply targets
22 that we're using to ensure that we are covering the bases
23 on all regions. They were developed several years ago
24 when we first started the Fisheries Information Program
25 four years ago and they were developed simply as
26 guidelines and that's a software as opposed to a
27 hardware.

28

29 It's possible that funding could increase
30 in one region and decrease in another region depending on
31 the importance of the information needed in those
32 regions. But we thought it would be helpful to show that
33 we were looking at all regions and developing some sort
34 of a framework to operate in to sort of guide us to
35 ensure that all regions were considered, so that's sort
36 of the foundation.

37

38 When we develop sort of the percentage
39 breakouts, and I don't recall off the top of my head the
40 factors we use in assessing that, clearly we did an
41 assessment of that and decided that in some regions we
42 needed to put more effort than other regions, obviously.
43 The basis for that included things like how much effort
44 in terms of research and monitoring was going on by other
45 entities, such as the Alaska Department of Fish and Game
46 and whether there were significant data gaps in those
47 regions or information needs in those regions that
48 weren't being addressed, that we could come in then to
49 supplement.

50

00026

1 So we looked at our program as sort of
2 coming in and supplementing things that were already
3 going on. That's sort of in a very general way the
4 backdrop of this. When we looked at the different
5 regions, we wanted to make them manageable and obviously
6 Bristol Bay and Kodiak/Aleutians were kind of lumped
7 together.

8
9 We are currently undergoing a review
10 internally right now of a lot of questions about the way
11 we structured this program and one of the questions that
12 we've asked and are looking at is whether or not we
13 should separate out Bristol Bay from Kodiak/Aleutians in
14 this process. So that is a question that we're looking
15 at right now. We've assessed that and we intend to
16 forward our assessment to the Federal Subsistence Board.
17 We don't have a date yet for when we're going to do that.
18 We're still working through the assessment part of it,
19 but that's certainly one of the questions we're looking
20 at. We did that because we've heard from you for several
21 years that not only your Council but Bristol Bay as well
22 that you felt that it needed to be separated out. I
23 don't know if that answers your question, but that's what
24 we're doing with regard to that question.

25
26 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes, that's what I
27 was looking for. And another thing maybe to add to that
28 and there's almost a certain dollar amount for the two
29 groups. In looking at our funding cycles, I would agree
30 if there was something that was critical in the Bristol
31 Bay region that needed assessing immediately and it was
32 something that we had supported and, if need be, and I'd
33 hope that they'd look at the same way for our region,
34 that they'd be willing to share a portion of the funding
35 if it was necessary. The reason I'd like to see that
36 done is, for some reason, as long as I've been the Chair,
37 it's come up every year.

38
39 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I have to
40 agree with you. When I think back to when statehood
41 occurred, where the funding went at the Federal level
42 within Alaska, within these areas, most of it went to
43 Bristol Bay. The same through the '60s, '70s and mid
44 '80s. The Department did a review and Bristol Bay was
45 spending a good portion on the dollar, fifty cents let's
46 say, and our region for research on salmon within the
47 Department it was pennies and I think the same was within
48 the refuge system. A lot of the resources went into
49 Bristol Bay.

50

00027

1 I was just looking at this chart and I
2 don't have the raw data for it, but I was just roughly
3 figuring through 2002, I broke out, just eye-balling,
4 Bristol Bay at 1.7 million from 2000 through 2002 and the
5 KARAC 610, and then from 2003-2006 projections, KARAC at
6 1.2 and Bristol Bay at about .1, so it is leveling off,
7 but there still has been -- you know, obviously there was
8 some big priorities there and I just have seen throughout
9 my lifetime in Alaska most of the funds go, whenever it's
10 a question within agencies, whether it's the Feds or the
11 State, more money goes to Bristol Bay and a proportion to
12 the resources and obviously that's politics.

13

14 So, in my mind, I would like to continue
15 along with our discussions we've had before on splitting
16 out this project and maybe in the Staff discussions you
17 might want to have some consideration where you do have
18 some crisis where the respective RACs or the Chairman or
19 something could provide advice on a transfer within that.
20 A lot of money has gone to the Bay. We've got a lot of
21 folks on the south side of the peninsula. I also look at
22 the question of the sociology and the economics. They've
23 always been in conflict and I just think it might be a
24 good idea to assuage or calm down folks' perspectives of
25 paranoia on the south side, to have those budgets split
26 or at least continue discussion in that direction. Thank
27 you, Madame Chair.

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. As
30 you were talking, I just started recalling something.
31 Prior to me being the Chair three years ago, there
32 weren't any requests, I think, or even if there was one
33 or two, from the Kodiak/Aleutians for funding or studies.
34 And I know when we had the meeting with all the groups
35 in Anchorage is when we requested to sit with -- and I
36 can't recall who it was, and we were able to use some of
37 the Staff people to look at some of the issues that we
38 might look at as potential funding for studies and also
39 had them help us or assist us in putting those requests
40 together. That may be a good portion of why that reason
41 is for the earlier years.

42

43 MR. HOLMES: Yeah, that was before my
44 time and you're quite correct, Madame Chair, so I should
45 retract some of my paranoia of my own, because,
46 obviously, Fish and Game wasn't in the position of asking
47 for funds at that time, but then they were much better
48 funded at that point. When they had considerable budget
49 restrictions, it had caused them to go with their hands
50 out to ask for Federal money, whereas before they were

00028

1 able to fund it themselves. So I apologize for being out
2 of line, if I was.

3

4 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: No, not out of line.
5 It's just sometimes we have to think back a few years.
6 Tom.

7

8 MR. BOYD: If I may, Madame Chair. I
9 would just like to maybe help to focus the Council on
10 what we're trying to achieve here with your input.
11 Obviously, it's difficult for one council, your council
12 or any other council, to see the bigger picture of what's
13 going on statewide in this program. I think when we come
14 to a council, we're focused on that region and what's
15 happening in that region. I think naturally when we put
16 dollars on the table and you see sort of a relative
17 amount between your region and another region, you're
18 going to focus on that because you want to ensure that
19 your region is getting its fair share and you're doing
20 good things in your region in terms of addressing issues.

21

22

23 I think that's really good and I think
24 you should have that information and you should use it as
25 sort of a background to really where you need to focus
26 and that is on the issues that you want to have
27 addressed. Where are the management concerns in your
28 region that need to have information brought to bear on
29 them that there is currently no information to address
30 those issues. That's what we're really looking for input
31 from you on. If we can get that, I think that will help
32 us then to be able to fashion a program that addresses
33 those needs.

34

35 Again, once we know what you've addressed
36 and we understand the reasons, that goes into the larger
37 picture of what we're doing statewide and we have to
38 weigh that out. But that's where we really need your
39 help. So if I could focus your discussion, I think you
40 hit on it a minute ago, Madame Chair, that's where I
41 would focus you. Then once we've identified those issues
42 and we bring before you now a plan, which we're doing
43 today for your region, have we addressed those issues.
44 If we haven't, what should we do to do that. Where have
45 we missed the mark. That's what I would like to focus
46 your discussion on.

47

48 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tom. I
49 agree. If you look back on this, and I guess I got a
50 little confused going back because, for some reason, it

00029

1 was my understanding that Afognak Lake was not being
2 funded, but if you look at this handout and it's also in
3 the book under 04-412, under 2004, it is in there. Ivan.

4

5 MR. LUKIN: I think, listening to Tom, we
6 shouldn't wait until some of these issues get to crisis
7 stage before we start trying to deal with them. We need
8 to move on and keep a balance here. Right now, in Port
9 Lions, we didn't have a coho run, so it makes you wonder
10 what's happening there. I guess what I'm trying to say
11 is we need to stay busy on all of these issues that are
12 important to us and keep on them, don't let one go.

13

14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I believe I have Pat
15 and then Pete.

16

17 MR. HOLMES: Do you want to go first,
18 Pete?

19

20 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just wanted to say,
21 you know, when this Buskin and now Afognak Lake they were
22 State managed, like Pat said earlier, and because of the
23 funding cuts on the State side is why it's all turning
24 over to the Federal Subsistence Division and trying to
25 get funding for these projects. Anyway, I really don't
26 understand this. It's just being recommended for
27 funding, Afognak Lake? Is that where it's at right now?

28

29 MR. FRIED: For 2004?

30

31 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Right.

32

33 MR. FRIED: Yeah. But there's two
34 options that I'll discuss later. Only one of those
35 options has been recommended by the TRC.

36

37 MR. HOLMES: Thank you, Madame Chair.
38 Thanks, Tom. I guess your question where are the
39 problems and what are our needs. Buskin is the biggest
40 one, but we've got a lot of knowns there. The one that
41 our Council identified at a previous meeting and the one
42 of greatest concern is continuing failure at Afognak Lake
43 and subsistence closures and what's causing that. I
44 think the whole island community really appreciates the
45 emergency funds that came from your agency to do the
46 smolt work this year when there was nothing to do that.
47 You folks went beyond your normal protocols to fund that
48 and I think that's some really good information. Correct
49 me if I'm wrong, Steve. The difference between option A
50 and option B, option A would include limnology in the

00030

1 Department's request proposal and option B is basically a
2 stock assessment and a smolt program without looking at
3 the lake and seeing what factors are affecting what's
4 going on. Is that the difference between the two?

5

6 MR. FRIED: Yeah, generally. And one of
7 them would just be continuing smolt work and the other
8 one would include some limnology work and some other
9 things with that.

10

11 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I have a
12 question I'd like to ask the Department. Steve, if you
13 folks only have option B, would you be able to determine
14 what's been happening in the lake as far as what's going
15 on or all you can say is, gee, we'll have another bad
16 year coming up?

17

18 MR. SCHROF: Madame Chair, Mr. Holmes.
19 My name is Steve Schrof. I'm with the Department of Fish
20 and Game in Kodiak. By just doing strictly the smolt
21 project, we would, based on the information we have,
22 looking at the numbers of smolt coming out, also some of
23 the size information and looking at the health of the
24 fish, we would be able to somewhat be able to look at
25 what the fresh water production is based on numbers and
26 the health of the smolt. If we happen to have like low
27 numbers of smolt coming out for that given year and we're
28 not collecting limnology samples in conjunction with the
29 smolt project, we could say, well, the numbers are really
30 low but we wouldn't have an idea of why that is.

31

32 With collecting some limnology
33 information, we could at least look at the lake and say,
34 yes, there was plenty of food in the system for the
35 juveniles to feed off of, no, there isn't. It would be
36 one other variable that we could look at in terms of if
37 there is other problems associated with the smolt
38 production. So it just gives us a little bit more
39 information in case something else were to go wrong in
40 terms of looking at smolt numbers.

41

42 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair, Steve. Wasn't
43 limnology work that was done at Karluk and Fraser, that
44 was one of the real criteria along with preliminary smolt
45 work that caused them to completely re-evaluate the
46 escapement goals for those systems. Isn't that the case?

47

48 MR. FRIED: Madame Chair, Mr. Holmes.
49 They did utilize limnological information to also look at
50 the escapement goals and re-evaluate the escapement

00031

1 goals. So it was just another tool that was used in the
2 modeling to strengthen their escapement goals for those
3 systems.

4

5 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I think it's
6 a small amount, but it's important criteria that goes
7 into evaluation of the system because Afognak Lake has
8 been manipulated. We've had KRA programs that had
9 funding for fertilization with support of the Afognak
10 Native Corporation and then we had some studies going for
11 a limited time, but then the FRED Division was closed
12 down and their work ceased. I think it's a really
13 important criteria to help folks understand why. With
14 smolt, we can understand, okay, the Department can say,
15 well, our smolt are coming out to fresh water and we know
16 most of them are going to be two and three ocean fish, so
17 we can give you a guess that you're going to have three
18 more years of failure.

19

20 In my mind, I'd like to know what's wrong
21 and what can be done to improve it. Myself, I'm quite
22 strong for the option A at 72,000 and I wonder if some of
23 the 130,000 would carry over into future years. What was
24 left over from '04 funding could be popped back in order
25 to provide for that information. If we had that for
26 three years, then we could see exactly what's happened.

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, I may ask Tom
29 to address that because I know within a fiscal year and
30 following their budgets, I don't know if they can carry
31 over funding into the next fiscal year.

32

33 MR. HOLMES: What Steve said he was going
34 to do was take 130 out for next year. Pardon me, Madame
35 Chair.

36

37 MR. FRIED: Actually, I think we're kind
38 of jumping around a lot. It went from an introduction
39 and now we're back to just one project. I think maybe if
40 we kind of take a look at what's there for all these
41 projects and what would be spent and what's left over, if
42 anything, and that might help. It wouldn't take very
43 long.

44

45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Go ahead. Steve,
46 why don't you just go ahead and lead us. I'm totally
47 lost because we have been jumping. You're asking us to
48 review what's been recommended and make a decision. Why
49 don't we go there.

50

00032

1 MR. FRIED: I would suggest we leave that
2 inter-regional stuff for later and jump to the studies
3 that are particularly for this area and then take a look
4 at the 12 proposals that are there. I think there's
5 seven for Kodiak/Aleutians, then you can take a look at
6 that as a whole and given the money that's available and
7 what it would take to fund whatever the TRC recommended,
8 you could decide whether or not you're happy with that
9 recommendation or you want to modify it and make some
10 changes to it and make your own recommendations.

11
12 Maybe just a good overview would be to
13 turn to page 81. There's a map that shows where all the
14 12 projects that are being considered for funding in 2004
15 are. If you look at the map, there's seven of those
16 studies that concern Kodiak/Aleutians. The seven studies
17 are 04-414, the Buskin River, which we discussed a little
18 bit. There is a description on page 119. All these
19 studies will have a detailed description, which includes
20 the investigators, the cost, what issues are addressed,
21 objectives, methods. The very last thing is the
22 recommendation from the TRC and their justification.

23
24 Project 412, which we discussed a little
25 bit, is the Afognak Lake study, and there's two options,
26 option A and option B. If you want to turn to a table on
27 some of these, there's Tables 3 and 4 on page 84 and 85
28 that list just the title and a number and the TRC
29 recommendation and the amount by year. Descriptions, as
30 I mentioned, are a little further back in there. So
31 option A for 412, which is Afognak Lake sockeye salmon,
32 would look at limnology, spawning habitat, smolt
33 abundance. Option B would be limited to just smolt
34 abundance and biological information.

35
36 Project 403 would continue the McLees
37 Lake weir for counting and sampling sockeye salmon.
38 Project 402, and there's two options on this, are for
39 Mortensens Creek weir. Option A would count and sample
40 both sockeye and coho and there's an option B that would
41 just focus on sockeye salmon. Project 406 would be a
42 brand-new project that would operate a weir on Unalaska
43 Lake that would count and sample sockeye and pink salmon.
44 Those would be the stock status studies.

45
46 There's also a couple of harvest
47 monitoring and traditional knowledge studies. These are
48 project 456, which would actually be a continuation of
49 work that's been funded. It would be for an additional
50 year of collecting subsistence salmon harvest data and

00033

1 traditional knowledge for 10 lower Alaska Peninsula and
2 Aleutian Island communities. Finally, Project 457 would
3 develop a more accurate subsistence harvest assessment
4 program for the Kodiak area and also document traditional
5 knowledge and that would be a new program. It would be
6 building on some other programs that are available, but
7 that would be a new study.

8

9 Out of those seven projects, I believe
10 the TRC recommended funding six of the seven. They
11 recommended funding five of the six -- out of the ones
12 they recommended for funding, five of them
13 are continuing projects, so they recommended for funding
14 Buskin, McLees weir option A, which would be both sockeye
15 and coho, recommended continuing the work on Afognak on
16 smolt, option B.

17

18 There's been a lot of concern about
19 Afognak. The TRC finding for doing smolt only on Afognak
20 was they found no compelling reason to collect additional
21 limnology or spawning habits and information until the
22 existing data was summarized and analyzed. Basically,
23 their point being that there's existing limnology data
24 that can be looked at that would correspond to the poor
25 returns that have been seen. So they didn't see a need
26 to collect further until you could see that data told you
27 something about the poor runs we've had to date. They
28 didn't want to spend more money on doing something when
29 they hadn't evaluated whether or not it was helpful.

30

31 Also, they've had some concerns that past
32 examination apparently led the State to determine that
33 rearing capacity was limiting production, which led to
34 fertilization, which meant that somebody must have done
35 some data analysis at some point, but they weren't privy
36 to the results of that information. Also, on top of the
37 fertilization, there was also some fry stocking, which
38 doesn't really seem to fit in with is spawning limited or
39 is it rearing limited or why was that done. Neither
40 fertilization nor fry stocking is being done any longer.

41

42 I guess their problem is they think the
43 smolt information is good, new information. The State is
44 already operating a weir, so we have escapement
45 information. The State already does harvest monitoring,
46 so we have that. The smolt they thought would provide
47 information on freshwater production is just an
48 integration of whether or not there's a freshwater
49 problem. It doesn't tell you what would be causing the
50 problem if you find one, which is what possibly limnology

00034

1 would do. So that was their justification for why they
2 would recommend funding smolt and not funding the other
3 components.

4

5 The one project that they didn't
6 recommend funding for this area was the Unalaska Lake
7 weir and they just thought it had probably lower
8 strategic priorities than the other studies that were
9 there and there was concern that even if the run could be
10 rebuilt, it doesn't really seem like it's ever going to
11 be big enough to satisfy the subsistence needs. They
12 also were concerned about the capacity-building component
13 of this particular study. They didn't think it had much,
14 so they didn't recommend that one.

15

16 For 2004, the total cost for the nine
17 projects they recommended would be about \$582,000 and for
18 the Kodiak/Aleutian portion of that, it would be about
19 \$325,000. So about half, a little bit less. Actually,
20 even funding the TRC recommendations still leaves
21 \$134,000 available within the whole study region. So
22 that would speak to that question about whether or not
23 you wanted to make some other recommendations, if you
24 have to take money out of another, there's still money
25 that is unallocated with a TRC recommendation at this
26 point. Hopefully that helped a little bit, but I can
27 answer more questions and maybe you want to discuss some
28 of this.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: The one thing you
31 mentioned between the 04-402 Mortensens, the A and B, was
32 one was sockeye and coho and one was just sockeye. Is
33 that what you said?

34

35 MR. FRIED: That's correct.

36

37 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: And both of these
38 have sockeye and coho on them.

39

40 MR. FRIED: You're right. They just kept
41 the same title, I guess. That's a bit misleading. The
42 one that would be the lesser amount of money would be the
43 one that would not do coho because in order to count coho
44 salmon you have to run the weir longer into the season.

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any
47 questions for Steve regarding Afognak option A and B?

48

49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair, I do.
50 Just looking at this, from what I could gather from it, I

00035

1 would rather go with option A on 04-412 and reduce maybe
2 one or two of the programs on 04-457.

3

4 MR. HOLMES: Pete, which one were you
5 going to reduce? I didn't hear you.

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: 04-457.

8

9 MR. CRATTY: I'd like to see something on
10 the old debate system. We went, I believe, three years
11 without a fall run there. This year the run come back
12 really good.

13

14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

15

16 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. Thanks for
17 your clarification, Steve. I wish I hadn't been stuck
18 down in the states taking care of family business so I
19 could have spent some time talking to you before. What
20 are your plans for the 134 that's left over for future
21 years?

22

23 MR. FRIED: The 134 that wasn't taken up
24 in this region? It really wouldn't be my plans. We'd
25 present this to the Staff Committee and the Board and
26 they could either decide to use it to fund a second year
27 of a multi-year study to free up funds. It's usually a
28 good idea to leave some money on the table to take care
29 of any modifications that might occur. It's also the
30 fact that if the Councils decide to select other studies,
31 that might take care of that money, too. If the Board
32 decides to go along with that recommendation, then that's
33 another way to spend that money. One way or the other
34 we'd use it within the program.

35

36 MR. HOLMES: So it would possibly be used
37 for something like the emergency funding for the Afognak
38 smolt that occurred this fiscal year as an example.

39

40 MR. FRIED: I wasn't even thinking of
41 that. I was just thinking of the existing projects that
42 have been submitted, either forward funding some of that
43 to free up money for 2005 or, like I said, there's some
44 studies that aren't recommended for funding by the TRC,
45 they might be recommended for funding by the Council or
46 the public or something, so that would provide some money
47 for that.

48

49 MR. HOLMES: So at this point it's just
50 kind of reserves, not anything really planned for it

00036

1 other than just maybe funding.

2

3 MR. FRIED: Right. At this point it's
4 just kind of unallocated money. The other thing that's
5 done is at the end of the TRC meeting usually what they
6 do is take a step back and look at all the regions just
7 to make sure there wasn't a very important study left on
8 the table. In general, if you go back to the
9 introduction, you'll see the TRC recommendations and then
10 overall what's left, if anything.

11

12 MR. BOYD: Madame Chair. I'll just add
13 briefly to what Steve has said. I think just to be clear
14 we're in a process here of developing the monitoring plan
15 for next year, 2004, and we've tried to address the needs
16 identified, the information needs identified. It's hard
17 to project ahead of time what the balance sheet is going
18 to look like, but we're giving you all the information we
19 have at this point. But B, we're going to commit all of
20 the 2004 monies in 2004 to the best of our ability to
21 cover those kinds of things that Steve spoke to simply
22 because it's not good business practice to carry money
23 over. We'll end up losing it if we do, generally
24 speaking. So we're going to commit it one way or the
25 other in executing this plan.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Tom. Is
28 there any more questions in regard to what's being
29 proposed as funded at this point? Pat.

30

31 MR. HOLMES: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
32 had a question for Steve Schrof. There's been a lot of
33 manipulation on Afognak Lake and I know at some time --
34 were there some limnology studies that were done in the
35 past on the lake that led to the -- obviously, there must
36 have been -- for the decision for fertilization? That's
37 question number one. Is there some pre-existing
38 limnology information that can be analyzed and could that
39 give us the answer to what has happened to these
40 catastrophic drops in production or is there a space too
41 much in time from when that information was gathered? I
42 mean if that was gathered in the '70s and they fertilized
43 in '80 and they quit and here we are a couple, three life
44 cycles later, would it be possible to look at that back
45 data to explain what has happened in these recent fun
46 failures? Is there data to do that?

47

48 MR. SCHROF: Madame Chair, Mr. Holmes.
49 Before the fertilization occurred, there's typically a
50 two-year feasibility study that looks at the limnology

00037

1 and also looks at the adult escapements and other
2 information we have. There is limnology data available
3 before the fertilization occurred. They did look at
4 that. You could go back and look at that information and
5 it would be useful, but during the fertilization years we
6 were also collecting limnological information too, so
7 that was very helpful, although we don't know what the
8 smolt were doing when they were going out, so we had no
9 idea during the fertilization period. We don't have
10 smolt information, so we don't know if they were dying in
11 the lake, if they had problems in the gravel
12 or other environmental conditions contributing to the
13 mortality associated with the juveniles or if there was a
14 problem with the adults out in the ocean.

15

16 There's a lot of gaps in between there
17 that we can't account for. What we typically like to do
18 with the limnology information coupled with the smolt
19 work is it gives us more pieces of the puzzle to try and
20 look at what's happening. Sometimes there's no
21 relationships, sometimes there are, but we like to
22 utilize that limnology information to see what those fry
23 are doing.

24

25 So there is information, limnology
26 information, when the runs were high in the '90s and then
27 they have declined in 2000, but we don't have that smolt
28 information back then, so we don't know what happened to
29 the smolt. We can look at the zooplankton and limnology
30 data. That information we have available. The lake
31 looked like it was producing at a high level because we
32 were fertilizing, but we don't know what happened to the
33 smolt, if they died in the gravel because of scouring or
34 if they were preyed upon. We don't have that
35 information.

36

37 So what we've tried to do with the
38 limnology is it provides us information on rearing at the
39 same time that you have the smolt information. If you
40 have smolt information one year and limnology in another
41 year, you can only speculate, but if you have them for
42 that year the smolt were rearing and we have that
43 information too, then we try and tie things together and
44 find out what some of the missing pieces or what some of
45 the reasons were as to why they did not come back or why
46 they died and there was just more pieces of the puzzle
47 that we can help determine or assess what the system is
48 doing or not doing.

49

50 MR. HOLMES: So, in summation then, you

00038

1 can make a guess based on what's happened in the past,
2 but to know what the problem is, you need to have both
3 components simultaneously.

4

5 MR. SCHROF: Madame Chair. It's
6 definitely helpful. As you're well aware, sometimes we
7 don't know what the situation is or what happened to
8 them, but it would be helpful to have that limnology data
9 at the same time that we had the smolt data, to be able
10 to look at it and say, yes, based on this they had
11 available food and the numbers looked really good smolt-
12 wise, health-wise, and it just provides another tool for
13 us to evaluate and assess that stock.

14

15 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I'm going to make a
18 recommendation at this point. I'm getting a lot of
19 different thoughts on other studies and where they fit in
20 here and I'd like to take a 15 minute break. When we
21 come back, I'd like us to be really clear or at least
22 have a pretty good sense of direction where we're going
23 because we're jumping and we need more information at
24 this point.

25

26 (Off record)

27

28 (On record)

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, did you have a
31 recommendation at this point?

32

33 MR. HOLMES: Yes, Madame Chair. The
34 folks from Kodiak discussed the question of option A and
35 option B on Afognak and we would like to see Afognak A
36 funded and if it's possible to use some of that carryover
37 money, we'd like to see that done. We also recognize in
38 the proposal that Fish and Game has that they do have a
39 series of back data and we would expect that they would
40 use this fund not only to do work so they would have it
41 for the existing year where they have both limnology and
42 smolt, but that they would go back also and go over that
43 back information they have and get that analyzed as soon
44 as possible so that we can see where we're going on
45 Afognak. Is that a fair statement, gentlemen?

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Do I hear any other
48 recommendations?

49

50 (No comment)

00039

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Hearing none, do you
2 want to entertain a motion to that effect?

3
4 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chairman. I would
5 like to move that our RAC endorse the full funding of the
6 Afognak Proposal A and that the additional approximately
7 30,000, wherever the resource is, possibly from the
8 carryover money of the 134 might be a source. So I'd
9 like to move that Option A be fully funded for Afognak
10 Lake research.

11
12 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

13
14 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Discussion. Call
15 for question. The question has been called. All in
16 favor signify by saying aye.

17
18 IN UNISON: Aye.

19
20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

21
22 (No opposing votes)

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.
25 Given that amendment, do I hear a motion to accept these
26 projects, including the amendment on Afognak Lake?

27
28 MR. HOLMES: So moved, Madame Chair.

29
30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pat
31 Holmes. Second.

32
33 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

34
35 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Pete
36 Squartsoff. Discussion. Call for question. Hearing
37 none. All in favor signify by saying aye.

38
39 IN UNISON: Aye.

40
41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

42
43 (No opposing votes)

44
45 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. The
46 next item on our agenda

47
48 MR. FRIED: Before I leave, I want to
49 make sure I understand what the Council is recommending.
50 They're basically accepting all the TRC recommendations

00040

1 except they would like to have option A for Afognak
2 instead of option B. So that means you're also accepting
3 the fact that they recommended Unalaska Lake not be
4 funded. Did you want to take any action on the inter-
5 regional projects?

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: (Answer not on
8 microphone)

9
10 MR. FRIED: That would start on page 61,
11 just three projects, and there's only one of those that
12 would affect Kodiak, and that was Project 751 that would
13 update the statewide subsistence harvest database and
14 report preparation and include shellfish and non-salmon
15 fish is in the database too.

16
17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

18
19 MR. HOLMES: 751 or 457? On page 87
20 there's recommendations for funding for 457.

21
22 MR. FRIED: No, I'd look at page 64, 04-
23 751 for inter-regional.

24
25 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I would like
26 to make a motion that our Council support the funding of
27 Project 04-751 as recommended by the TRC.

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pat
30 Holmes. Do I hear a second?

31
32 MR. CRATTY: Second.

33
34 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Discussion. Call
35 for question. All in favor signify by saying aye.

36
37 IN UNISON: Aye.

38
39 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

40
41 (No opposing votes)

42
43 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.

44
45 MR. FRIED: I guess the only other action
46 item I'd like to bring to your attention isn't in your
47 books. There's a handout that lists the issues and
48 information needs. These were developed for the 2004
49 studies. Come November 1st, a call will go out for
50 proposals for 2005. I guess my question to the Council

00041

1 would be does this list still encompass all the issues
2 and information needs that you're interested in so that
3 when somebody is developing a proposal they can use this.
4 For 2004, you indicated that your priority was Afognak
5 Lake. Is this still true for 2005? Do you still want to
6 see more studies come in or is there some other issue or
7 issues that you'd like to particularly see studies on?

8

9 MR. LUKIN: Madame Chair. I would like
10 to just bring up the silver salmon fall run in Port Lions
11 that we might consider putting on this list.

12

13 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. This looks
14 like a fairly comprehensive list. I would like to make
15 one correction down on Atka Island. A year or two ago
16 when I was talking about I believe it related towards
17 gathering information on subsistence salmon use for the
18 island and that might link into your other proposal.
19 Anyway, you might just want to eliminate pink and just
20 put subsistence salmon. I think at one time we had a
21 fisheries committee for our RAC and I think these are
22 pretty much the points that we've raised before of places
23 of concern, although priorities are going to change with
24 time.

25

26 Thank you.

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. I
29 do have one question. When we were looking at these
30 lists of studies, are all these systems on Federal lands?
31 Looking at the Atka one and Port Lions, is that on
32 Federal or State lands?

33

34 MR. FRIED: State.

35

36 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: So what are the
37 qualifying factors? They need to be on Federal?

38

39 MR. FRIED: At least the stocks should be
40 harvested within a Federal subsistence fishery. There
41 has to be some connection to managing Federal subsistence
42 fisheries. The study itself can be of Federal lands as
43 long as there's a link to Federal subsistence management.
44 As far as whether it's a strong link or a weak link, you
45 would rank it in importance against other studies.

46

47 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I've got at this
48 point to change Atka Island subsistence salmon and silver
49 salmon run at Port Lions. Are there any other items that
50 you think should be added at this time?

00042

1 (No comment)

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Hearing none, would
4 anyone like to entertain the motion to accept this list
5 as amended?

6

7 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chairman. I'd like
8 to move that we pass on this list as amended.

9

10 MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Richard
13 Zacharof. Discussion. All in favor signify by saying
14 aye.

15

16 IN UNISON: Aye.

17

18 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

19

20 (No opposing votes)

21

22 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried.

23

24 MR. FRIED: Thank you. I will look into
25 Port Lions coho and make sure there's some connection to
26 the Federal subsistence management and get back to you.
27 If there is, I'll just put it on the list that goes out
28 in 2005. Just one more information item on page 139.
29 There's a little one-page write-up on the Partners for
30 Fisheries Monitoring Program. Just for your information,
31 there have been seven positions filled. There's six
32 fishery biologists, one social scientist. They're within
33 a local organization. They're funded through OSM, but
34 they're actually hired by and work for a local
35 organization within that area. There aren't any
36 positions within the Kodiak/Aleutians area at this time.
37 There is going to be a call for another position, a
38 social scientist, and if there is an organization within
39 Kodiak/Aleutians that's interested in having a social
40 scientist Partners position, this would be the time to
41 put in a proposal to get one of those positions. This is
42 just a little summary on what the program is.

43

44 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Steve, under this
45 Fisheries Monitoring Program, the person that's hired is
46 working with BBNA, that covers both Bristol Bay and
47 Kodiak/Aleutians, is that correct?

48

49 MR. FRIED: Right now it looks like
50 they're covering Bristol Bay-Alaska Peninsula and doesn't

00043

1 include Kodiak. At least I'm not aware that he's done
2 any work for Kodiak/Aleutians.

3

4 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is there anything
5 else, Steve?

6

7 MR. FRIED: No, that's about it. Thank
8 you. Unless you have any other questions, then I'm done.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: Thanks, Steve.

11

12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Okay. The next item
13 is Greg. Agency reports. We have draft predator
14 management policy.

15

16 MR. BOS: For the record, I'm Greg Bos,
17 Fish and Wildlife Staff Committee member. The draft
18 policy on predator management and accompanying Staff
19 analysis is in your Council books under Tab D. The
20 policy is on page 145 and the analysis begins on 147.

21

22 The analysis and draft policy are being
23 presented to you and the other Councils for comment
24 before the Board takes final action on the policy in its
25 upcoming December regulatory meeting. Over the years the
26 Board has received a number of regulatory proposals to
27 increase the harvest of predator species, primarily
28 wolves and bears.

29

30 Some people have looked to Title VIII and
31 the subsistence harvest regulations as a means to reduce
32 predator populations to increase prey species
33 populations, such as moose and caribou, that are really
34 important for subsistence uses. However, the Board has
35 not approved proposals whose apparent purpose is to
36 reduce predator populations and has taken the position
37 that predator control is the prerogative of the land
38 managing agencies.

39

40 It's been a strong concern of a number of
41 Councils, so the Board asked the Staff to review the
42 issue, develop an analysis as a basis for establishing a
43 Board policy on how proposals for harvest of predators
44 would be considered.

45

46 This policy that is before you is
47 intended to clarify to the Councils and others who wish
48 to submit proposals for increasing harvest of predators
49 on how the Board will consider such proposals. The
50 analysis reviewed various references in Title VIII that

00044

1 might be applicable to predator management as well as the
2 Board's regulatory authorities and responsibilities and
3 previous guidance in the program concerning predator
4 control.

5
6 Basically, the analysis found that the
7 Board's authority and responsibility is to provide the
8 opportunity for continued non-wasteful subsistence uses
9 of wildlife, including predators, on the Federal public
10 lands by rural Alaska residents, but that the Board does
11 not have authority to adopt regulations for predator
12 control. The final environmental impact statement that
13 established the Federal subsistence program states that
14 predator management or predator control, along with
15 habitat management, is the responsibility of the land
16 managing agencies.

17
18 So, because the Board does not have the
19 authority to engage in active predator control, it's
20 necessary that the Board distinguish between those
21 proposals to reduce predator populations from other
22 proposals that would provide for increased opportunity
23 for subsistence use of predators and it would act only on
24 requests that provide for subsistence use of harvest of
25 predators.

26
27 While approving regulations that provide
28 for subsistence use of predators, the Board recognizes
29 that there may be secondary effects that would benefit
30 prey populations, but the Board will ensure that the
31 primary purpose of this action is to provide for direct
32 personal and family consumption of predators.

33
34 Accordingly, the predator harvest
35 proposals whose apparent purpose is to benefit prey
36 populations will be returned to the proponents and the
37 proponents will be referred to the appropriate Federal
38 agency, land managing agency or the State Board of Game
39 for consideration of their concerns. When it's
40 appropriate, the Federal Board will encourage those
41 agencies to give serious considerations of those
42 requests. That concludes my summary of the policy and
43 I'd be glad to answer any questions or if you have
44 comments about the policy that can be carried forward to
45 the Board.

46
47 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, did you have
48 anything?

49
50 MR. HOLMES: Madame Chair. I haven't

00045

1 read this as in depth as I have the fisheries issues, but
2 I would like to share with our Council that when I was at
3 the Board of Game meeting last year to present our
4 compromised proposal on goats, I was there for their
5 discussions on predator control and the current Board of
6 Game is weighing with this heavy issue themselves and are
7 liberalizing in some areas where they're having some
8 extreme problems. So I think this is a good step to look
9 through and analyze things and see if there might be some
10 selective strategic measures that might be implemented
11 over short periods of time that might benefit food items
12 for rural folks, so I think this is a good step forward,
13 although I don't have as strong a view on this as I would
14 over fish issues, but I think it's a good start. Thank
15 you, Madame Chair.

16

17 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Pat. Is
18 there any other discussion? I know from my standpoint
19 I'm happy to see this and I've been in statewide meetings
20 where this has been brought up a couple times. The other
21 thing in looking at this, I know from our area and
22 standpoint, is the caribou and then the predator control
23 being the wolf. Not so much wolf, although we see an
24 increase, I think, of that population, but the bear
25 population I know is -- we really had a big problem in
26 two of our communities this summer and that's False Pass
27 and King Cove on the bears. You have kids playing on the
28 playgrounds at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon and a bear
29 walking by them, they're on the roads, they're crossing
30 the roads, they're where they shouldn't be at all hours
31 of the day and night and that concerns me. We were
32 fortunate given the population and the problem that we
33 had this summer that we didn't have an incident.

34

35 I guess now by State law if you shoot a
36 bear, you have to skin it and you have to process it and
37 you have to send it out with a State person and they, in
38 turn, have the hide and process it and it's up for
39 auction. Nobody wants to go through that whole process,
40 to be honest. This is an issue of health and safety. I
41 will say, for the record, the police department says we
42 don't want to deal with it. We don't want to stop doing
43 what we're doing to skin this bear out and process it.

44

45 I did call King Salmon this summer and
46 Cold Bay. Rick's assistant is who I did talk to. I think
47 I was at the point of calling the governor's office on
48 this because it is a concern and this may be something
49 that many of you that are on Advisory Councils can look
50 at sometime in the future as to what can be put into

00046

1 place to address this issue because I'd hate to see
2 something happen. Is there any other questions for Greg?

3

4

(No comments)

5

6

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Right
7 now the next will be Staff Committee, but I was going to
8 ask if maybe Judy can come up and introduce herself.
9 Some of you know Judy and some of you don't, but Judy is
10 on the Federal Board and is with the Park Service.

11

12

MS. GOTTLIEB: Thanks. Nice to meet you
13 all. Thank you, Della, for the recognition. I'm glad to
14 be here. As Della said, I'm on the Federal Subsistence
15 Board and I do try to get to some of the Regional
16 Advisory Council meetings so I can hear firsthand a lot
17 of your deliberations. Della does a great job of
18 relaying the concerns and representing the region's
19 concerns. Sometimes our issues, as you know, are
20 complicated and there's a real benefit of hearing all the
21 pros and cons of discussions and not only the final
22 outcome. I'm glad to be here today and it worked out
23 good for those of us in Anchorage to meet you here in
24 Anchorage. I hope you have some productive discussions.
25 To just reinforce, we know you're volunteers. We really
26 appreciate your time, your efforts and especially your
27 knowledge. On behalf of the whole Board, we really do
28 listen to what you have to say. So thank you for your
29 time.

30

31

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Judy.
32 The next item we have is Staff Committee role. Glenn
33 Chen.

34

35

MR. CHEN: Thank you, Madame Chair. Good
36 afternoon members of the Council. My name is Glenn Chen.
37 I work for the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The material
38 I'm going to present to you today is found on page 165 of
39 your Council book behind Tab D. I'm here on behalf of
40 the Interagency Staff Committee as its representative and
41 I would like to discuss an issue that's very important to
42 us and that's the role of the Staff Committee in the
43 process of developing subsistence regulatory proposals.

44

45

As described in the Federal Subsistence
46 Management Regulations, the Staff Committee was
47 established to provide assistance to the Federal
48 Subsistence Board. Our Board members rely upon us for
49 support and advice regarding procedures, policy and
50 technical matters in the Federal program. Recently,

00047

1 however, there have been some concerns raised by a number
2 of Councils and Council Chairs regarding our role. There
3 are perceptions that we are having undue influence on the
4 Federal Subsistence Board, especially with regard to the
5 decision-making process for subsistence regulatory
6 proposals and also the Board's consideration of Regional
7 Council recommendations on these proposals.

8

9 These concerns were expressed most
10 recently at the May 2003 Federal Subsistence Board
11 meeting here in Anchorage. In response, Chairman Mitch
12 Demientieff directed that a review of our role in the
13 process of developing subsistence regulations be
14 conducted.

15

16 To date, Staff Committee and the Board
17 have met several times under the Chairman's direction.
18 At this point, we have developed a number of proposed
19 changes to the Staff Committee's role that we'd like to
20 present to the Kodiak/Aleutians Council for their review
21 and feedback. To make it easier to follow the
22 presentation, I'd offer the suggestion that you look on
23 the table on page 167 of your Council book.

24

25 Peggy Fox from OSM developed this table
26 and it provides an excellent summary of the process that
27 the Staff Committee currently uses for reviewing
28 regulatory proposals and how the proposed changes could
29 modify the process and address Councils' concerns.

30

31 Referring to your table there on page
32 167, the first step, once OSM receives a proposal it
33 undergoes a proposal analysis. This is done by a staff
34 of biologists and anthropologists. Prior to the Council
35 meeting, the Staff Committee and also members of Alaska
36 Department of Fish and Game have an opportunity to review
37 these analyses. They're still in draft form before
38 they're published in the book. So we provide feedback
39 and comment on these draft analyses. That's the process
40 we currently use. We're not proposing to change that,
41 but we'd like to add a step of allowing the Staff
42 Committee to develop talking points on these proposals
43 that we would then bring to you guys at the Council
44 meeting, which brings us to the next step.

45

46 The Council meeting. At present, Staff
47 Committee attendance is optional. Actually, we don't
48 have a role at these meetings. What we're proposing to
49 change here is that we would make it mandatory that a
50 Staff Committee representative be present at every

00048

1 Council meeting to discuss the wildlife and/or fish
2 proposals. If Council so desires, upon your request,
3 we'd provide assistance to the RAC any policy, procedure
4 and technical matters regarding the proposals. We'd also
5 provide briefings and other subsistence issues, such as a
6 predator management issue that Greg Bos discussed with
7 you earlier.

8

9 What we're hoping to accomplish with some
10 of these changes are the following. One, it would give
11 us the opportunity to provide direct support to the
12 Councils during the meeting and we'd also have the
13 opportunity to establish direct communication between the
14 Council and the Staff Committee early on in the process
15 rather than later.

16

17 Once the Council meetings are concluded,
18 the Staff Committee then holds its own meeting and this
19 year it's scheduled for November 12th and 13th. At this
20 meeting we develop our recommendations to our Federal
21 Board members. At times, the Council Chairs are
22 sometimes invited to participate in the Staff Committee
23 discussions. What we're proposing to change here is we
24 would make it mandatory that we allow the Council Chairs
25 to participate in the Staff Committee meetings when the
26 Staff Committee reviews the proposals for that particular
27 region.

28

29 What we're also offering to change is
30 that the Staff Committee would not provide a formal
31 recommendation to the Board. We would develop and
32 assessment of the proposal and provide comments to our
33 Board members. As you know right now, the Staff
34 Committee provides a Staff Committee recommendation to
35 the Board that's included in the Board book and the Board
36 considers. As you know, sometimes when the Staff
37 Committee has a disagreement, there's a minority and a
38 majority of recommendation.

39

40 So what we're hoping to accomplish with
41 some of these changes are the following. Again, we're
42 trying to establish or allow for direct communication
43 between the RAC Chairs and the Staff Committee during the
44 meeting before they go to the Federal Subsistence Board.
45 We would like to have the RAC Chair present the Council's
46 recommendation directly, provide the Council's
47 perspective and answer any questions regarding the
48 Council's recommendation at the Staff Committee meeting.
49 We hope to give the RAC Chair an opportunity to be fully
50 involved in all discussions and for the Council Chair to

00049

1 bring the Staff meeting information/discussions back to
2 the Council following the meeting and share that with all
3 of you.

4

5 The last step is the Board meeting and
6 right now our role is that we give a formal presentation
7 to the Board at the Board meeting and this presentation
8 follows the presentation of the Council's recommendation.
9 What we're proposing to change is to actually delete this
10 step. There would be no formal role, there wouldn't be a
11 formal recommendation from the Staff Committee. Our
12 analysis and comments would be provided in the Board's
13 book in printed format.

14

15 Presently, Staff Committee sits behind
16 the Board during the Board meeting and that would remain
17 the same. We would just try to minimize our side
18 conversations in what appears to be small group meetings
19 that take place behind the Board to try to reduce some of
20 the distraction.

21

22 At present, sometimes the Board chooses
23 to make a motion on a proposal by adopting the Staff
24 Committee recommendation. Where we propose a change is
25 that Board instead would begin it's discussion and
26 deliberation on proposals by making a motion based on the
27 Council's recommendation, not the Staff Committee
28 recommendation.

29

30 So, what we're hoping to accomplish with
31 some of these changes are to focus the Federal
32 Subsistence Board on the RAC's recommendation, we're
33 hoping to emphasize compliance with ANILCA Sections
34 805(c) and 815, and to make it clear that the Staff
35 Committee would not be at the same level as the Regional
36 Council with regard to the Board's deliberations.

37

38 Toward the end of these materials on page
39 168 in your Council book, that shows a time line for the
40 Board's current consideration for resolution of this
41 issue concerning the Staff Committee's role. There would
42 be a Staff Committee person left in the south present at
43 each Council meeting to give a briefing to all the
44 Council members. As I mentioned previously, the Board is
45 seeking your feedback on these proposed changes. The
46 Board would also like to hear about any additional
47 suggestions that the Kodiak/Aleutians Council might offer
48 to resolve this issue regarding our role.

49

50 Then the Board will consider all the

00050

1 Council's comments and suggestions and discuss this issue
2 again with the Council Chairs at its December 2003
3 Federal Subsistence Board meeting. Then the Board then
4 plans to make a decision during or soon after the
5 December meeting and will direct the Staff Committee to
6 implement the desired changes.

7

8 I just want to mention that this is not
9 the only opportunity that the Council has to provide
10 comments. We invite all members of the Council to
11 provide any other feedback and suggestions to us over the
12 next couple months. You can contact us by phone or other
13 means any time up until December. We, again, look
14 forward to your feedback when you review some of these
15 proposed changes.

16

17 Thank you.

18

19 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Glenn.
20 Does anybody have any comments or suggestions at this
21 time in regard to what we were just briefed on?

22

23 (No comments)

24

25 MR. CHEN: Thank you, Madame Chair.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I do know this has
28 been an issue sometimes at the statewide level when some
29 of these proposals are gone through. I think sometimes
30 we're fortunate to some degree. Our issues aren't quite
31 as heavily weighed as some of the other areas. Federal
32 Subsistence Board Composition. Greg.

33

34 MR. BOS: Thank you, Madame Chair. Greg
35 Bos, Fish and Wildlife Service again. This topic is
36 really about the Governor's request to have a State
37 representative appointed by the Secretary of Interior to
38 be a non-voting member of the Federal Subsistence Board.
39 I believe materials have been provided to you, copies of
40 the letter and a page out of the record of decision. As
41 all of you or most of you are aware, the Secretary
42 received a letter from Governor Murkowski in July
43 requesting that the commissioner of the Department of
44 Fish and Game or his designee be appointed to the Federal
45 Subsistence Board as a non-voting member.

46

47 First, let me say the Secretary requested
48 the Federal Board to develop a recommendation concerning
49 the Governor's request and considering that request the
50 Board has reviewed the record of decision, which is a

00051

1 document that was signed by the Secretary of Interior
2 when the Federal Subsistence Program was first
3 implemented. There was an environmental impact statement
4 that described a number of alternatives for the operation
5 and structure of the Federal program. The Secretary
6 selected one of the alternatives with some modifications
7 and his selection was documented in this record of
8 decision. There is a part of that decision by the
9 Secretary that described the membership of the Federal
10 Board and provided for the appointment of a State
11 representative as well as the Regional Council Chairs as
12 liaisons to the Federal Board in a consultative role.

13

14 This is the first time, however, that the
15 Governor of the state of Alaska has elected to nominate
16 anyone for such an appointment since 1992 when the record
17 of decision was issued. Currently, the Department of
18 Fish and Game Staff provide comments on regulatory
19 proposals at the Federal Board meeting; however, they do
20 not actively participate with the Board in the Board's
21 deliberations unless specifically questioned by a Board
22 member.

23

24 The Federal Board met on September 26 to
25 discuss this issue in an executive session. Recognizing
26 the sensitivity of this issue to Alaskans and subsistence
27 users and the reaction by many of those to the Governor's
28 request, it was felt appropriate to have the Board's
29 further consideration of this request be in a public
30 forum, so the Board has scheduled a work session for
31 November 5th to consider the request and develop a
32 recommendation for the Secretary.

33

34 This work session will be open to the
35 public; however, it will not be accepting testimony from
36 the public. The Board may elect to ask members of the
37 public, the State or the Regional Council Chairs for
38 their views on the request, but Regional Council Chairs
39 will be online for that meeting and will be participating
40 and the Board has asked the state to clarify some aspects
41 of the request.

42

43 We're providing this information to you
44 now so that, first of all, you're aware of the status of
45 the request, how the Board is handling it and if you have
46 comments or recommendations that you wish to provide to
47 the Board at this time, it would be appropriate to do so.

48

49

 Thank you.

50

00052

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Greg.
2 Does anybody have any comments or suggestions in regard
3 to this?

4
5 (No comments)

6
7 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Hearing none. I
8 guess I'll wait to hear for the teleconference. Next
9 item looks like regulatory cycle review briefing.

10
11 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. That was
12 just an informational item only for the Council, but if
13 the Council does have questions, there are Staff here to
14 answer.

15
16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Did we get someone
17 for the sea otter issue yet?

18
19 MS. PETRIVELLI: This is Pat Petrivelli
20 for the record. I called Doug Burns and at Michelle's
21 recommendation I said to be here at 3:20, so he should be
22 here in 10 minutes.

23
24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. Izembek
25 National Wildlife Refuge. Rick Poetter.

26
27 MR. POETTER: Madame Chair, Council.
28 Thank you for hearing me. Rick Poetter from Izembek
29 National Wildlife Refuge. You've got my briefing in your
30 packet, but I'll just sort of highlight some of the
31 things that have changed or happened since then.
32 Particularly under waterfowl. We continued with our
33 annual Steller's eiders banding effort and we did real
34 well this year. We only fell short of our goal of 2,500
35 birds by 50 birds, so that was real good. In fact, we
36 did accomplish a capture of 800 birds in the Norma Bay
37 area which normally is really hard to capture eiders in.
38 We tried some different things this year and it worked
39 out really well. We captured some birds that hadn't been
40 captured in a long time and this was most evident because
41 the aluminum bands were pretty much wore out on them, so
42 we did a lot of replacement in that area.

43
44 We had, again, four students come down
45 from Barrow School District. They work in the summer up
46 there doing nest searches for eiders. We sent a student
47 from the local area up there for the first time, a
48 student from Cold Bay, and she participated with them
49 down here when they came down. They also worked with Dr.
50 Peter McCroix, who had been out in the Izembek area

00053

1 studying eel grass back in the early '60s and he's doing
2 some follow-up work with some ecosystem team money that
3 we provided to him and he includes them in his work. So
4 basically the students get a full picture of what the
5 life cycle of the eiders are and then they go back and
6 make presentations to their councils, schools and any
7 other groups they can think of and some of them are
8 looking at doing science projects for State competition,
9 so it's really progressing into quite a program for the
10 schools up there.

11

12 We also on the last drive that we did
13 collected four Steller's eiders to be transported to the
14 Sealife Center in Seward. They had collected something
15 like 20 birds this past winter out at Dutch Harbor as to
16 have a captive breeding flock. I think they had a
17 problem with a few birds, so they ended up needing four
18 new ones, so we provided those. They're currently still
19 in quarantine, but they're doing really well health-wise.

20

21 Similarly on Steller's eiders, we get
22 band returns sent to us from our banding lab of any bands
23 that are picked up off of birds, whether they're found
24 dead on the beach or hunted. Most of them are taken in
25 Russia, but this year we happened to notice there was a
26 few taken in Kodiak, so that raised some suspicions and
27 it was turned over to law enforcement and ended up
28 prosecuting a few individuals. I don't know all the
29 details of it. As a result of that, because it's a
30 listed species, there's a limit of take, whether doing
31 research or incidental hunting, et cetera, and it was
32 felt that because of this there was an exceeding of take
33 and so there was a need to increase or consult and talk
34 about what can we do to get more information out and
35 improve knowledge of hunters so they don't have
36 accidental take. Obviously these were accidental or they
37 wouldn't have returned the bans in if they had known what
38 they were doing.

39

40 With that, along with putting more
41 information out and we've got some posters that we're
42 developing and put in the local area around Cold Bay
43 where mostly eiders are potentially taken and also doing
44 some increased enforcement effort on the local hunters
45 that come there watching for accidental take of eiders in
46 the area.

47

48 On to caribou. We're going to be trying
49 to do the annual count and hopefully get another good
50 shot at it. We're going to shoot for another November

00054

1 period to try and do that. Waiting for a bit more snow
2 to push the animals out of the hills a little more and
3 then once we get the upper level snows hopefully we'll
4 still have clear grounds below and we'll try and get a
5 full count survey on those again. It's important to keep
6 up on exactly what's happening, especially if we're
7 increasing harvest and want to see what's happening. I
8 assume the State may eventually take a look at the
9 harvest levels too in the next cycle and make changes or
10 not. I don't know.

11

12 On moose, actually I had a question -- I
13 guess I'd like to hear the Council's view concerning
14 continuing the subsistence hunt for moose in 9(D). Are
15 you looking to do that or trying to get out of that?
16 Probably the biggest advantage of it is that you have the
17 designated hunter provisions, which are a big plus for
18 those who can't get out. The negative part is the land
19 ownership, it has to be on Federal lands. As I said
20 before, most of the moose are found that time of year not
21 necessarily on Federal lands because of the access. The
22 easy accesses are along the shorelines, which are usually
23 corporation owned. Anyway, I'd like to see what Council
24 thinks as to whether to discontinue that or whether
25 you're favoring that.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Rick, can you answer
28 me, I know you stated in your report that the State has
29 opened it up, but is that still until they receive 10
30 reports that they've harvested 10 moose or what exactly
31 are the regulations on it?

32

33 MR. POETTER: That particular part I
34 don't remember. I'd have to look it up. Dick Sellers
35 isn't there anymore and the new guy supposedly has been
36 selected but hasn't reported yet. The way I understood
37 it is it's open and the goal is to get 10 animals only.
38 If it starts exceeding that, then they would take a
39 serious look at doing something different again.

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I know we talked
42 about this last year and whether or not we wanted to do
43 this. I'll be honest with you, due to my traveling, I
44 didn't get the notices posted in time. I did have, I
45 think, two people out of our office that picked them up.
46 I don't know if they were able to harvest a moose. I
47 wouldn't mind doing it one more year just to get a sense
48 of how many people are able to harvest moose. I know
49 there's a lot of interest in moose.

50

00055

1 MR. POETTER: That's probably a good way
2 to do it for now. We'll see what happens. We wanted to
3 just keep it local. Something to be thinking about for
4 sure. Regarding bears, I don't disagree with you, Della,
5 necessarily. People's safety in the village is real
6 important, no doubt. We now have some new data from that
7 intensive survey done the spring of 2002. My opinion,
8 the villages would be best served to get in contact with
9 the new State biologist and talk with that individual and
10 see what his or her plans are going to be regarding that.
11 As they're State and private lands, of course, we try not
12 to do anything that would exert their jurisdiction over
13 the bears and that's why when folks call and say we've
14 got this bear problem in the village, we want to help as
15 much as we can, but we don't want to over-exert ourselves
16 over the State. So we do try to get the local officer,
17 if he's present, and he usually is during fishing season,
18 to deal with it.

19

20 It will be interesting to see what
21 happens because I noticed the previous cycle where we
22 built up because we have these every other year seasons
23 in the fall. The way it happened last time -- even Cold
24 Bay had a lot of bear problems previous to the hunt, then
25 the next year after didn't seem to have anywhere near as
26 big a problem. It will be real interesting to see what
27 happens this next year.

28

29 Still in the process of selecting guides.
30 I had to go back and redo the process. They didn't quite
31 follow the instructions correctly. Anyway, some of it's
32 done, but not all of it, so I really don't want to say
33 who got what yet. Waterfowl guides, I know that's always
34 been an interest of the committee. We only had two
35 primary guides working out there this year and then one
36 of the big game guides also got a waterfowl guiding
37 permit and hardly used it. Things have toned down as I
38 figured they would. There's this big push and then
39 people found out it's not as easy as it looks on the map
40 and expenses and economy has dropped. They're not
41 getting as many clients. That's all I had then unless
42 you have some questions for me.

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Yeah, Rick. Pete
45 Squartsoff. I had one on what's the status of the
46 emperor goose and refuge?

47

48 MR. POETTER: To be honest with you, I
49 don't know the current counts. Chris Dow and a group
50 were down there doing their survey of the entire

00056

1 peninsula. I don't know their numbers for this year.
2 They're trying to meet a population level to where they
3 can open them up. I assume that's what you're talking
4 about, is opening for hunting. We haven't completed our
5 composition surveys where we go out and look at the
6 adults versus the juveniles. I'm really not sure what
7 the current status is compared to last year.

8

9 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I guess another question
10 on the emperors. Do you think they may open for
11 subsistence or just going to wait for numbers and open
12 statewide?

13

14 MR. POETTER: Well, the regular migratory
15 bird hunting season doesn't have a subsistence component
16 in it. The new spring/summer subsistence does that could
17 potentially allow it. So I don't anticipate any
18 separation or changes from the regular fall season. I
19 don't know of any specifics on that. Our local
20 representative, Stanley Mack, probably knows the most of
21 what's going on with that.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any other
24 questions for Rick?

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you.

29

30 MR. POETTER: Thank you very much.

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I see Leslie made it
33 here, so we'll move on to Kodiak National Wildlife
34 Refuge.

35

36 MS. KERR: Tracy Fischbach is not here
37 because she's out in the field and we couldn't send Tanya
38 because she's just about to deliver, so we really didn't
39 want her to be away from home at this point in time.
40 Most of the reports for Kodiak Refuge are pretty
41 straightforward. I can go over briefly some of the ones
42 I think might be most interesting where we had the most
43 activity and then I'll talk about a few other things that
44 may be of interest that are not included here that are
45 not really related to subsistence regulations but which
46 may be of interest to the Council.

47

48 I think one of the big things this year
49 had to do with the fisheries management. Again, the
50 Litnik system had very low escapements early on, so we

00057

1 did participate with the State of Alaska and do a joint
2 closure. I know there have been several other reports
3 related to that that you have either heard or will hear
4 that aren't included here, so I won't get into too many
5 details.

6
7 I think island-wide it was a very odd
8 year for fish. It seemed that some of the runs were
9 early, some of the escapements were low, fish tended to
10 be holding offshore in some places, went right up the
11 river when they got in. Of course, there have been a
12 fair number of major rain storms that have caused
13 fluctuations in water levels. We did continue to have
14 somebody down staffing the Akalura weir. It's a test
15 project to look at the possible use of video counting
16 towers. The idea is that if we were able to use this
17 technology, we can collect more data without more people.
18 The problem is there's a lot of stuff that floats down
19 those rivers and you have to keep picking it off the
20 counting tower. I think it's a good idea but all the
21 bugs have not been worked out.

22
23 The Buskin weir project, Donn Tracy was
24 going to talk about that. Litnik smolt, somebody else
25 was talking about that, too. A lot of halibut
26 subsistence permits, the refuge played a small role in
27 distributing these permits, but not a major role. I'm
28 waiting to see what the harvest numbers are. We usually
29 don't know yet exactly what happened there, but we're
30 kind of waiting to see. The feedback I heard was people
31 were pretty happy with it.

32
33 The deer browse and mortality surveys, it
34 was such a mild winter we really didn't find any
35 mortality. The deer populations are very healthy. We've
36 already started to see an upswing in deer hunting effort
37 by both sport and subsistence hunters.

38
39 Brown bear. We did the Karluk Lake unit
40 in our intensive aerial survey this spring. We had
41 intended to do the Terror River area, but it was just an
42 odd year. Things greened up too fast, so we had to go to
43 the Karluk Lake area. I don't know if we'll go back and
44 try to do Terror River next year or if we'll go to the
45 Shearwater next year, but it will be one of those two
46 areas.

47
48 So far we haven't had a lot of
49 subsistence deer hunting permits, like the designated
50 hunter permits. I think there's only been one issued or

00058

1 there may have been more. I've signed a couple of elk
2 permits recently and I think the first subsistence elk
3 ever was finally taken from Afognak Island and that was
4 kind of nice that that was happening. We did spend a lot
5 of time this year, Tanya and Tracy worked quite a lot, on
6 the spring migratory bird hunting issue and whether the
7 road system in Kodiak should be closed or open and how to
8 manage this. Of course, that's a different council, but
9 I know people here are interested. I see many people
10 here that I know were also involved in that.

11

12 I'm not going to talk about the sea
13 otters because I saw that Doug got here. The
14 conservation plan, our estimate when we prepared our
15 report for the Council, was that it was going to be ready
16 to be released this fall. At this point, there have been
17 a lot of delays in terms of getting the administration to
18 release plans based on issues like wilderness and wild
19 and scenic rivers, so it looks like we're going to get
20 some resolution on that, but we have been delayed in our
21 process and the plan will likely come out in the
22 beginning of summer with a summer long review period and
23 then public meetings in the fall of 2004.

24

25 Some of the other things we've been
26 working on that might be of interest to the Council
27 relate to implementation of the Koniag agreement. That's
28 been a pretty interesting project. There was a permit
29 system instituted on the Karluk River this year. Again,
30 we haven't had a chance to evaluate the results of that.
31 It was a little bit odd because the king season was
32 closed in the middle of it. It's going to be interesting
33 to see what our survey work tells us, but we have sent
34 out a user survey to look at user satisfaction and what
35 they think about the management regime that's been
36 implemented based on the provisions of the Koniag
37 agreement.

38

39 We've also been doing a fair amount of
40 work with Ahkiak- Kaguyak, Incorporated to actually start
41 doing some of the things we're supposed to do per that
42 easement agreement. It was signed in 1995. I think
43 because of the turmoil on the Board and whatever and
44 turnover in our staff, we're now getting to the point
45 where we have been working with them quite a bit this
46 year trying to have a law enforcement presence during the
47 fall hunting season in the Olga Bay area. They are now
48 offering public use permits for sale through several
49 vendors for the easement lands and hopefully things will
50 work out better in terms of keeping people off of private

00059

1 land.

2

3

4 If there are any other issues that people
5 are interested in related to Kodiak Refuge, I would be
6 happy to answer them. We are having Tanya work on a
7 newsletter that will pretty much talk about all the
8 refuge management things that we're doing that you guys
9 should all be on the mailing list for. With that I'll
10 end my report and ask for questions.

11

CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat.

12

13

14 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I've got a question for
15 you on this halibut subsistence permits. Over 1,300
16 permits were issued. Is that including the villages too
17 or just Kodiak?

18

19

20 MS. KERR: I don't know the answer to
21 that. I know it includes Kodiak and certainly we didn't
22 issue all these permits, but I can find out.

23

24

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: That's just a little
26 scary to me. 1,300 permits at 20 fish a day, that could
27 be a lot of halibut.

28

29

MS. KERR: Yeah.

30

31

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I don't suppose this
33 included anybody on the Coast Guard base.

34

35

36 MS. KERR: I don't know. I don't think
37 they qualify. It will be interesting to see what kind of
38 harvest is reported.

39

40

41 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Just looking at the
42 numbers there, it could be some great potential conflicts
43 in the future.

44

45

46 MS. KERR: I think it's going to be very
47 important to take a look at the actual harvest that's
48 reported and see how many people with those permits are
49 harvesting the maximum number of fish and to track that
50 over time because it may be that the limit is too high.
51 So we obviously have to keep tabs on that.

52

53

54 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: One of the things
55 too, Pete, just for your information, I know the tribal
56 offices in the Aleutian region received all the
57 applications for permits. I know that we processed a lot
58 of them out of our office. Does anybody have any

00060

1 questions for Leslie?

2

3 MR. CRATTY: I do. Leslie, did you ever
4 get any samples on the geese?

5

6 MS. KERR: No, we didn't.

7

8 MR. CRATTY: I hear Peter is the new
9 designated goose sampler.

10

11 MS. KERR: Oh, okay. I should have
12 mentioned this. We are also developing plans to
13 participate in a winter range pilot study for black
14 scoters. Of course, we did a fair amount of work with
15 the Steller's eiders and in the newsletter we're sending
16 out we're including a one page double-sided flyer on
17 identification of the Steller's eiders and we're just
18 going to insert that in our newsletter.

19

20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you, Leslie.
21 I'm going to move to the sea otter, but I wonder if we
22 just take a 10-minute break so we can discuss with the
23 gentleman a little bit of what the questions that came
24 out of the work session this morning.

25

26 So 10 minutes.

27

28 (Off record)

29

30 (On record)

31

32 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We had asked Doug
33 Burn to give us an update on the sea otter. I did
34 forward to him some of the issues that came out of the
35 village seminar of the Aleut Corporation earlier this
36 morning. Mainly the concern was -- I guess an update,
37 number one, and the concern being that sometimes with the
38 Steller eider being listed on endangered species and the
39 effect that it's had on our region. So, with that, I
40 guess I will ask Doug to give us an update on sea otters.

41

42 MR. BURN: Thank you, Madame Chair. I
43 think your previous meeting was last March in Kodiak and
44 I believe I spoke at that time. Since that time, the
45 proposed rule to list sea otters in Southwest Alaska has
46 moved farther along the list of people that have to sign
47 it in Washington, but it has not been given final
48 approval for publication in the Federal Register and we
49 have not been given a publication date or an anticipated
50 publication date, so we really don't know when that's

00061

1 going to happen.

2

3 One thing that has happened in the last
4 six months or so was we did some surveys out in the
5 Aleutian Islands. Some of the islands that Dr. Jim Estes
6 had surveyed in the year 2000 we surveyed six of those
7 sites in 2003 and the preliminary results are the decline
8 at least in those locations is continuing fairly
9 dramatically. We're in the process of working with the
10 USGS to put together a fact sheet and a press release on
11 these new survey results and that will probably be coming
12 out the end of the month. That's really all I can offer
13 new on where the listing is.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Is anybody studying
16 the potential possibility -- I know I've heard the
17 possibility that maybe they're migrating for food
18 sources. It was mentioned in the meeting this morning
19 that over the course of years that does happen based on
20 food sources. The other question I guess I would have
21 is, has anybody determined if there's a possibility that
22 maybe killer whales or some other predator source might
23 have on this?

24

25 MR. BURN: Let's start with the second
26 question first, the issue of killer whales. Recently,
27 that hypothesis of the killer whale predation kind of
28 popped up in the news again. Alan Springer from UAF in
29 Fairbanks and Jim Estes and a few other people published
30 a paper that had some coverage in the newspaper. The
31 theory they have is it was the removal of the large
32 whales from the north Pacific that caused killer whales
33 to sort of begin eating their way down the food chain and
34 they've worked their way through harbor seals and sea
35 lions and now they're on to sea otters. That theory is
36 largely circumstantial. When Dr. Estes developed the
37 hypothesis of killer whale predation, it was largely by a
38 process of elimination. The area he studied, which was
39 in the central and western Aleutians, he didn't find
40 anything to suggest that those other sources of mortality
41 were really going on. So this process of elimination led
42 him to believe it was killer whale predation. We have
43 been trying for the last several years to get funding to
44 do those other sorts of studies about survival and
45 reproduction and looking at the prey base and their body
46 condition.

47

48 We've been trying to get the funding to
49 do that in the Kodiak area for the last several years.
50 The proposals we've put in have been favorably reviewed

00062

1 but it's my understanding the pot of money only goes so
2 deep. While they like the proposal, they don't like it
3 enough quite yet to fund it, so we continue to pursue
4 those funds to do that study in Kodiak.

5
6 Back in the 1980s a researcher from
7 California had done some studies of the prey base in the
8 Kodiak area. We'd like for him to repeat those studies
9 to see if it's a food resource issue. There was also a
10 study in the '80s on survivorship and movements and we'd
11 like to repeat that study as well, but we haven't had
12 much success getting funding to do those studies.

13
14 As far as the migration issue goes, from
15 what we know about sea otters from telemetry studies,
16 they generally occupy small areas. Animals will spend
17 their whole lives within a fairly small area of the
18 shoreline. There are instances where animals will kind
19 of branch out. Usually what happens is when they get to
20 the point where food may become limiting, they'll move on
21 looking for greener pastures.

22
23 We don't think that's what's going on in
24 Southwest Alaska because we're talking about a fairly
25 large area and a lot of sea otters. Some modeling work
26 that we've done suggests that the Aleutian decline may
27 have been a loss of 65,000 sea otters. Frankly, there's
28 not too many places you can hide 65,000 sea otters. If
29 they moved some place else, they'd be pretty obvious. The
30 notion that they're making these long-range migrations to
31 other areas really doesn't fit what we know about their
32 movement patterns and we really don't have any other data
33 that would suggest that's what's happening.

34
35 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Then I guess that
36 one other issue and concern from our minutes from the
37 meeting in Kodiak and the effect the sea otters do have
38 on a subsistence source, which is the clams in our
39 region. I know this was something that was brought up
40 from the gentleman from Atka this morning and also
41 mentioned from Unalaska and I know this is an issue
42 around False Pass also.

43
44 MR. BURN: I guess I would say that
45 that's not really something that the Fish and Wildlife
46 Service is equipped to deal with. However, I would
47 suggest the Council contact the Alaska Sea Otter and
48 Steller Sea Lion Commission. That's the organization
49 that we work with on conservation and co-management of
50 subsistence uses of sea otters. One of their projects

00063

1 that they worked on a number of years ago, they
2 contracted Dr. Brendan Kelly from UAF to write sea otter
3 management plans and one of the considerations in those
4 management plans was the effect of sea otters on other
5 subsistence resources, particularly crab and shellfish.
6 I think working with the Alaska Sea Otter and Steller Sea
7 Lion Commission it would be possible to develop
8 management plans for sea otters that do consider their
9 impacts on the subsistence resources. We really can't go
10 out and manage sea otters directly, but Alaska Natives
11 can take them for subsistence purposes, so that would be
12 a vehicle whereby a village or a tribe could manage the
13 sea otters within their areas.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Does anybody have
16 any questions for Doug?

17

18 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I do. What is your next
19 process with the sea otters right now with the numbers
20 dropping? What's going to happen next?

21

22 MR. BURN: At this point, our highest
23 priority is to get that proposed rule published. We
24 believe the population is declining at such an alarming
25 rate that it warrants protection on the Endangered
26 Species Act. At that point, we would form a recovery
27 team and we would develop a recovery plan and we would
28 continue to monitor the population to see if it's
29 continuing to decline and also where the remaining
30 animals are and those areas we would be particularly
31 concerned with. At this point, because of our limited
32 resources, getting them listed is a priority because that
33 will make more funds available for recovery planning and
34 other activities.

35

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just feel that more
37 and more people are getting concerned because if they do
38 get on the endangered species list, what's going to
39 happen to the other things that go on in the area?

40

41 MR. BURN: Well, I'm not sure what things
42 you're referring to.

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I mean if they get put
45 on the list, they may shut down areas or whatever for
46 harvesting subsistence foods.

47

48 MR. BURN: I don't believe that's likely
49 because, as I understand the Endangered Species Act,
50 there's really not a mechanism to do that. The process

00064

1 that occurs most often with a listed species is an
2 interagency consultation, then they have to consult with
3 the Fish and Wildlife Service to make sure that that
4 activity does not impact sea otters. At this point, I
5 don't believe that those activities that you're concerned
6 about have that connection to the Federal government, so
7 it doesn't trigger that process, that consultation
8 process, so it really never happens. I'm still learning
9 all the intricacies of the Endangered Species Act. It's
10 fairly complicated and I think there's a number of
11 misunderstandings about what it does and what it doesn't
12 do. I think one of our biggest challenges is going to be
13 outreach in the communities to let people know this is
14 what we think the effects are going to be.

15

16 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: You were discussing
17 this recovery plan. What is the process when you do
18 these plans and how much is the public able to be a part
19 of it when you're putting these plans together?

20

21 MR. BURN: There will be a public comment
22 period associated with the proposed rule when people can
23 comment on that aspect of adding them to the Endangered
24 Species List. I have to admit that I don't know a whole
25 lot about the recovery planning process because I haven't
26 been a part of that at this point. I think that recovery
27 plans do get a fair amount of public review, but I'm not
28 certain of the process because I haven't done it yet.

29

30 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Doug, if you can
31 find out where I can get that information. That was a
32 question that was brought up, is once they get to the
33 process of putting together these recovery plans, people
34 felt like they didn't have enough input as to how this
35 was going to happen and sometimes these get put into
36 place and are set in stone without the public actually
37 knowing what's going on. They thought the public should
38 be involved.

39

40 The other piece of this is there was
41 actually a request to find out whether we would support a
42 resolution opposing sea otter being on the threatened and
43 endangered species. So my guess at this point would be
44 if the various tribal entities wanted to oppose this,
45 that they can pass resolutions to that effect and once
46 this gets to the public comment period and the proposed
47 rule. Is that correct?

48

49 MR. BURN: I think that would be the
50 appropriate time. Until the proposed rule is published

00065

1 in the Federal Register, there's really nothing to
2 comment on. It would be better to wait until that period
3 and know what is being proposed and then comment at that
4 time.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Did you say that the
7 recovery plan is part of the proposed rule or how did
8 that work?

9

10 MR. BURN: No. The process, as I
11 understand it, you have the proposed rule, there's a
12 public comment period and within one year of the
13 publication of the proposed rule we have to issue a final
14 decision as to whether or not to proceed or whether new
15 information has been presented that says it's not
16 warranted to add this animal to the list. Assuming that
17 the final rule does add them to the list, at that point
18 in time the recovery process begins. If we had
19 publication today, it would be a year until the final
20 rule and then there would be the formation of the team
21 and the beginning of the process. I'm not sure how long
22 it takes to write a recovery plan, but I think it's a
23 thorough process.

24

25 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you.

26

27 MR. BURN: And I will talk to folks in
28 the Endangered Species Division, finding out more about
29 the public input into the recovery planning process and I
30 will get that information to you as soon as I get it.

31

32 Thank you.

33

34 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I just want to make a
35 comment. A lot of people are concerned because of the
36 clams and crab. It's more like a cycle because of the
37 food and when the resources come back, then the sea
38 otters will come back.

39

40 MR. BURN: It's been proposed or
41 suggested by a number of people that it might be
42 cyclical, but if it is, it's like nothing we've ever seen
43 before. Typically the cycle is that they overshoot what
44 the habitat can support, then the population comes back
45 down to a lower stable level, but it doesn't crash down
46 to the levels that we're seeing, the extremely low levels
47 that we're seeing. Some of these declines are more than
48 90 percent, which is really unprecedented. It's just not
49 clear if that's the case here.

50

00066

1 MR. LUKIN: Have you been getting higher
2 numbers in other areas like Southeast or any place else?

3
4 MR. BURN: The USGS did a survey last
5 year of lower Cook Inlet and the Kenai Fjords area. We
6 really don't have anything to compare the Kamishak Bay
7 survey to because it was the first time it was ever
8 surveyed. The numbers of sea otters in that area around
9 Augustine Island are quite high. On the other side of
10 Cook Inlet, in the Katchemak Bay area and the Kenai
11 Fjords area, the numbers there were about comparable to
12 what they were in 1989, the previous survey. Prince
13 William Sound, after the oil spill, the population
14 started to come back a bit. There are still places in
15 Southeast where there are no otters. We're not quite
16 sure why that is, but we're waiting for the results of
17 the 2003 survey and then we'll look at Southeast
18 population as a whole. We're not seeing really huge
19 increases anywhere throughout Alaska.

20
21 MR. HOLMES: How do you know which number
22 is carrying capacity? We've all seen through our
23 lifetimes these populations build and build to the point
24 where they totally exterminate things that people eat.
25 It's unfortunate there aren't any friends of the butter
26 clams because I've seen places where they totally cease
27 to exist until the otters left. The same with sea
28 urchins all the way to Shemya. They've gone up and down
29 and it's a cute, warm, fuzzy little critter, but there
30 aren't any friends of the butter clams, so that's all
31 I've got to say.

32
33 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Are there any more
34 questions? Doug, I appreciate the information and look
35 forward to getting more so I can pass it on to the
36 natural resource people with APIA and they can make sure
37 the various groups in the region get that information.
38 Next item, we are to written reports. Afognak Lake Smolt
39 Enumeration Project. Steve.

40
41 MR. SCHROF: My name is Steve Schrof.
42 I'm with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in
43 Kodiak. I just wanted to come to the Council meeting and
44 give you an update on the stock assessment and production
45 monitoring that went on in Afognak Lake this summer.
46 More specifically to talk about the summary of the smolt
47 project undertaken this summer.

48
49 To start off, why are we assessing the
50 sockeye salmon stock at Afognak Lake. As this graph

00067

1 shows, the sockeye salmon runs, which include escapement
2 and harvest information attributed to Afognak Lake
3 production was at a very high level throughout the '90s
4 with escapements, often exceeding the upper level of the
5 escapement goal, which was 60,000. In 2001 and 2002, the
6 minimum escapement goal of 40,000 was not achieved.
7 Starting in 2002, commercial and subsistence fishing was
8 closed and sportfishing was severely restricted.

9

10 So the closure of the subsistence fishery
11 in Afognak for 2002 was unprecedented and concerned
12 subsistence users. Afognak Lake sockeye salmon has been
13 an important resource for the villagers in Ouzinkie and
14 Port Lions and residents of Kodiak.

15

16 So, with the funding that was procured
17 the previous fall in 2002, the focus was to evaluate
18 sockeye salmon smolt production and condition of the
19 smolt resulting from adult escapements that occurred in
20 2001 and 2002. More specifically, we first wanted to
21 estimate sockeye smolt by age immigrating to the ocean.
22 Second, evaluate the health and the size of the smolt.
23 Lastly, determine the migration timing of the smolt by
24 age.

25

26 To accomplish these objectives we
27 installed a floating incline plane trap in the Afognak
28 River to catch the immigrating smolt from Afognak Lake.
29 This trap has been used successfully at other locations.
30 However, we encountered low water this past year because
31 of the low snow load and limited rain. On May 24th, we
32 replaced this floating trap with a Canadian fan trap,
33 which is this right here. The opening of the fan trap
34 sits on the river bottom and the opening is right there
35 and aluminum panels are put out in a V-shaped direction
36 in approximately 30 degrees. The fan trap funnels smolt
37 into the catch box.

38

39 The smolt trap occurred from May 12th to
40 July 3rd and the actual estimated count was 82,970
41 sockeye smolt for the reason. To estimate the total out
42 migration from Afognak Lake, we employed marker capture
43 techniques and basically this shows some of the smolt.
44 We employ a dye test, which wears off in three to four
45 days, so it's not a problem for food and things of that
46 nature for eating purposes. The dye test allows us to
47 perform a weekly test to look at the immigrating smolt
48 that are captured in the trap. In 2003, with this
49 expanded count, we estimate 411,594 sockeye salmon smolt
50 migrating from the Afognak Lake System.

00068

1 A portion of the migration was sampled
2 for age, size and health data. Basically the age one
3 smolt accounted for 84 percent of the migration. Their
4 average length was 79 millimeters and they weighed four
5 grams and had a condition factor of .82. Age two smolt
6 accounted for 15.7 percent of the migration or the
7 remainder of the migration. We didn't encounter any age
8 three smolt. The condition factor determined the well-
9 being of the smolt. A smolt condition greater than .7
10 would be considered healthy. You can see age one and two
11 they were above the .7 mark, so they were considered
12 fairly healthy for the system.

13

14 This graph shows the immigration timing
15 for age one and age two smolt. The age two smolt
16 migrated out primarily within the first two weeks of the
17 project and then quickly dropped off. We started to see
18 the age one's dominate toward the later part of the run
19 and basically were the dominant age migrating out. Age
20 one smolt do typically migrate out first. Not always.
21 It's system specific, but generally the older fish do
22 migrate out first out of systems in the Kodiak area.

23

24 This is hard to see, but it's just
25 basically the summary of 2003 smolt season, 411,000 smolt
26 were estimated out of the system and we consider this a
27 reasonable estimate for this system. Age one smolt were
28 the dominant age class and their health looked good and
29 sometimes this is an indication that there is a healthy
30 food supply in the lake for them to grow well enough for
31 them to migrate out. They reach a certain threshold size
32 and they will move out. If there wasn't enough food
33 available in the system, they would tend to stay in there
34 another year.

35

36 Capture rates from the capture testing
37 were varied, but were normal for this type of system
38 based on the water fluctuations we encountered. The
39 average capture rate of 19.9 percent was within a
40 targeted range that we were looking at of 15 to 20
41 percent. So the outlook for 2004 looks promising to us.
42 We feel that this will be the second year for the smolt
43 project and we also feel we have the proper trap now for
44 obtaining fairly accurate smolt estimates. Obviously,
45 it's depending on funding of this project, but we're
46 hopeful for that. So after our first year we feel we
47 have a pretty good understanding and a pretty good idea
48 of what to expect out of Afognak Lake.

49

50 We also planned to test other assumptions

00069

1 to improve the accuracy of the estimate. There's been
2 other studies with smolt projects relating to marker
3 capture of this type of trapping system and catchability,
4 so we're going to look at also improving our accuracy of
5 our estimate. So that's all I really have for the smolt
6 project. Just to mainly update the Council for the 2003
7 season as well. Leslie alluded to earlier the adult
8 sockeye salmon count. The escapement this year was
9 27,766 in 2003.

10 Commercial fishing was not open to target
11 Afognak Lake sockeye salmon this season. The lower end
12 of the escapement was again not achieved for the third
13 year in a row. However, the 2003 escapement was larger
14 than the two previous years, so that's somewhat
15 encouraging, I guess. Afognak Bay was closed to
16 subsistence fishing on June 7th and remained closed for
17 the sockeye salmon fishing season or the migration for
18 the sockeye salmon was opened up later on, I think in
19 August. Sportfishing was also reduced to allow
20 escapement into the system.

21

22 The Council had touched on a little bit
23 before, the investigative plan was submitted for three
24 more years to fund the smolt project and currently the
25 TRC recommended only funding the smolt project. The
26 Department of Fish and Game feels that the other
27 objectives would provide better information and better
28 understanding of production potential and system
29 dynamics. We hope the Council would support funding all
30 the objectives, which it sounded like you did, so that
31 was nice to hear.

32

33 Finally, the goal is stock assessment on
34 Afognak Lake sockeye salmon runs is to hopefully
35 stabilize the run and to maintain it for sustainable
36 resource for subsistence users and all other user groups
37 in the Kodiak area. That's all I have for today. I'll
38 entertain any questions.

39

40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I have one. Do a lot of
41 Dolly Varden get caught in that trap when they're coming
42 down with the smolt?

43

44 MR. SCHROF: Mr. Squartsoff. We did
45 catch quite a few Dolly Varden early on in the migration,
46 but it did tail off towards the middle part of June and
47 we didn't see quite as many. We had a varied range from
48 juveniles to adults. We did keep count of those.

49

50 MR. SQUARTSOFF: My question is, on those

00070

1 Dolly's, did you happen to open them up and, if so, did
2 you find out what they were eating?

3

4 MR. SCHROF: Madame Chair. No, we didn't
5 cut them open at all. We just basically counted what was
6 in the trap. We know the Dolly Varden prey on the
7 sockeye smolt migrating out, but we don't have an idea of
8 what impact they're having on the stock.

9

10 MR. HOLMES: Steve, what's the ocean age
11 of the returning adults to that system?

12

13 MR. SCHROF: Mr. Holmes. The predominant
14 age class are typically one/three, two/two and two/three,
15 so you'd be looking at these smolt coming back in 2005,
16 2006 as adults. We were projecting like a 10 percent
17 return from smolt to adult and that's a rough number, but
18 based on that information you would expect close to
19 40,000, which is the minimum escapement goal, but that's
20 distributed over several years.

21

22 MR. HOLMES: Thank you.

23

24 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Any other questions?

25

26 (No comments)

27

28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you for your
29 report. Very well done. It's my understanding that the
30 Buskin River Sockeye Fishery and Stock Assessment and
31 King Salmon Fisheries reports are information only. I do
32 want to go back to page 211 and this gives the various
33 reports on some of the projects that are being done. I'm
34 not sure who's going to be able to help me with this. I
35 look at this Mortensens Creek weir project and I know one
36 of the reasons we had requested this was because of the
37 possible conflict between user groups being subsistence
38 and sports. I'm going to touch on something. I know I
39 brought this up before, but I'm going to do it again.

40

41 Maybe being involved with this issue
42 between the two communities of King Cove and Cold Bay and
43 the possible Hovercraft or whatever we eventually end up
44 with, in reading some of the documentation and letters to
45 the editor in the paper, his name specifically is Howell
46 who used to be a resident of Cold Bay, and his comments
47 in regard to the people in King Cove only want access to
48 Cold Bay so they can hunt and fish. I look at this
49 report and I see that 14 of these people are subsistence
50 fishermen, 27 are sportsfishing groups that were

00071

1 interviewed at Mortensens Lagoon, all 14 subsistence
2 groups were residents of Cold Bay, while the sportfishing
3 groups consisted of 82 percent Cold Bay residents, 14
4 percent non-residents, continuous 48 states and three
5 percent King Cove residents and one percent all other. I
6 do go back a little bit where I feel that more effort
7 needs to be put in these two communities and that Izembek
8 Refuge and I've threatened Rick that I'm going to stay on
9 this Board until it happens. Anyway, I just bring that
10 up for the record because it does concern me when
11 statements like that are made.

12

13 Where are we on the agenda? I believe we
14 have the issue of John Foster. We need a motion for
15 recommendation that we send a letter to the Secretary of
16 Interior so that alternate Richard Zacharof can take his
17 place for the remainder of John Foster's term.

18

19 MR. HOLMES: Can I just take your words
20 and make that a motion? I'd like to move what the
21 Chairwoman just stated.

22

23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second?

24

25 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Second.

26

27 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Given that this is
28 an issue that involves a Council member, the reason being
29 is the missed meetings and I will ask for a roll call
30 vote.

31

32 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Al Cratty.

33

34 MR. CRATTY: Yes.

35

36 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Ivan Lukin.

37

38 MR. LUKIN: Yes.

39

40 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Vince Tutiakoff.

41

42 (No response)

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Pete Squartsoff. Yes.

45 Patrick Holmes.

46

47 MR. HOLMES: Yes.

48

49 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Paul Gunderson.

50

00072

1 (No response)

2

3 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Speridon Simeonoff.

4

5 (No response)

6

7 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Della Trumble.

8

9 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

10

11 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Richard Zacharof.

12

13 MR. ZACHAROF: Yes.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion passes with
16 six yes, zero no and three absent. I believe the other
17 item on our agenda is call for items for 2003 annual
18 report. Michelle.

19

20 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. At this
21 time, this would be a call for items that the Council
22 would like to have brought before the Board that are
23 outside the regulatory cycle. So this is your
24 opportunity to put together items which we would put
25 before the Board. What would happen now is items would
26 be drafted up and it would be put forward to the Staff
27 Committee and they would respond to those items and it
28 would go to the Board and a letter would come back to the
29 Council stating what happened on those items.

30

31 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I think in the past,
32 Michelle, we've gone back to our minutes of our meetings
33 and between the two of us drafted that report. I don't
34 have any other items to add to it at this time.

35

36 MR. HOLMES: Where did we end up with on
37 splitting the FIS research funds? Is that going to be
38 decided by Staff or do we need to take a position or did
39 we go around in a circle?

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Tom.

42

43 MR. BOYD: Madame Chair. With regard to
44 Mr. Holmes' question, we have heard your concerns and we
45 are elevating the concern in our review of the Fishery
46 Resource Monitoring Program and sort of the framework
47 that we operate in there's a number of issues that we're
48 assessing and this is one of them. We have developed an
49 assessment of that very issue of whether or not
50 Kodiak/Aleutians should be separated from Bristol Bay and

00073

1 that question will be advanced to the Federal Subsistence
2 Board and we will inform them of your desires in that
3 regard.

4

5 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, for the record,
6 Tom and I did discuss this a little bit earlier. One of
7 the things when we do this, you know, we didn't have
8 proposals and that may be a reason why those numbers look
9 that way. That being on thing. I know the past three
10 years I've been watching that and they have been coming
11 out fairly close. The other idea, when you think about
12 this, if there was something in our region that needed
13 immediate attention and was going to cost a good number,
14 that may have our region technically utilizing more funds
15 than the other region. I'm not sure if we split that,
16 that that's a good idea, but it may be something we think
17 about and then in some of the discussion that comes up in
18 the Federal board to see what actually comes out of their
19 discussion and for us to think about that a little bit
20 more.

21

22 I also would like to talk -- and it's too
23 bad someone from the Bristol Bay Board wasn't here to
24 find out what their discussions are in regard to that.

25

26 MR. BOYD: Let me just say that
27 historically, what I've heard from both Councils, is a
28 desire to, as Chairman O'Hara would put it, to get a
29 divorce. That's the message we have received and that's
30 the message we're carrying forward. If that message is
31 changing, then I guess we would need to know that.

32

33 MR. FRIED: No, I don't think so. I
34 think both councils feel the same, that they would rather
35 be two separate study regions. I know Bristol Bay and
36 the Kodiak Council have been careful not to take stands
37 on on studies within other areas. If there's been a
38 problem, I know both Councils have supported other
39 studies to address those. That's where it stands now.

40

41 MR. BOYD: Madame Chair, if I may. Even
42 if the Board decides to treat the two regions separately,
43 I think it's important to note what I said earlier, these
44 are simply guidelines. It doesn't mean that a higher
45 level of funding can go to any region of the state. It's
46 based on priority and needs. These are just targets for
47 us to get sort of a framework for developing a monitoring
48 plan, but they're not so hard that we can't shift funds
49 from one region to another to meet the important needs.
50 So I would think about that as you go forward.

00074

1 MR. FRIED: I think people were afraid
2 when the program first started that it was very possible
3 in any one year that some regions would get no funding or
4 maybe for several years. I think they wanted to have at
5 least some guideline, some formula to make sure that the
6 regions were part of the program so everybody was
7 benefitting. After all the money is kind of allocated by
8 projects and the TRC makes a recommendation, we do make
9 them go back and take a look to make sure that there's
10 nothing in any region that was left out because of the
11 funding not being there.

12
13 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: TRC brought
14 something to my mind. It's my understanding that the TRC
15 is comprised of biologists and is it people from State
16 and Federal managers are involve?

17
18 MR. FRIED: Yeah, it's a little short on
19 social scientists, but there are some. Basically there's
20 a representative from each of the five Federal agencies
21 and there's also representatives of Department of Fish
22 and Game, Division of Subsistence, Sportfish and
23 Commercial Fisheries. It's chaired by Steve Klein, who
24 is the chief of our division. In addition to that, we
25 put two partners on there mostly for their learning, but
26 also so they can take part in discussions. That's the
27 composition.

28
29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: As we go through
30 this process, the Council makes recommendation or the
31 Staff makes recommendation, they're selection also, then
32 the TRC makes recommendation, we get to go through it
33 again to make our recommendation and then it goes from
34 here to the Federal Board. I'm wondering when you have
35 an issue like this, and I'll use Afognak as an example,
36 that's controversial and I've heard Kodiak express a dire
37 need to have this reviewed, when you're in that
38 deliberation process as Staff or the TRC to have a
39 representative from that area able to answer any
40 questions before a decision is made I think may -- you
41 know, I sometimes feel, I think, sometimes that some of
42 these decisions are made and they do end up weighing
43 strongly on the side of Staff or the TRC when it gets to
44 the Federal Board and I'm hoping -- I know I brought this
45 up the other day -- whether there's another piece that we
46 can add to that. At least they can hear sometimes or why
47 from that person why they feel this study is more
48 important than another one that's on the list or how it's
49 funded if you've got the A and B options.

50

00075

1 MR. FRIED: What we started to do last
2 year is handling the study proposal the same way as the
3 regulatory proposal. We'd bring before the Board a
4 consensus, a list of all the studies that both the TRC
5 and the Council support and then a non-consensus list and
6 then focus on the non-consensus items and indicate why
7 there was non-consensus on that to help the Board focus
8 on what they need to think about. I'm assuming they can
9 ask for further information from any of the Council
10 Chairs or anybody else.

11
12 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Thank you. That
13 leaves us to -- I think we've covered the annual report.
14 We'll go through our minutes, Michelle and I. Time and
15 place of next meeting, Tab F.

16
17 MS. CHIVERS: Madame Chair. I did pass
18 out more updated calendars and put them in front of each
19 of you. For the winter calendar, we just need to confirm
20 our meeting dates, which we currently have set as March
21 18th and 19th in Larson Bay.

22
23 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Pat, did you have a
24 comment or question?

25
26 (Mr. Holmes not on microphone)

27
28 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: We've tried to have
29 it in Unalaska, we've tried to have it in Adak, we've
30 tried to have it in St. Paul. Somewhere there's a line
31 that says we can't go past Cold Bay. I believe it has to
32 do with cost in the distance.

33
34 MR. SQUARTSOFF: I do agree with you,
35 Pat. I felt we should have gone to these other places.
36 A lot of times we tried to propose it, but it just never
37 would work out that we could go to them places. So we
38 just settle on King Cove and Cold Bay and Sand Point. We
39 were trying to go to Nelson Lagoon a couple times, but it
40 never worked out either.

41
42 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: I'd recommend
43 October 13th and 14th. The reason I say this is I know
44 the Aleut Corporation each year has their meetings the
45 middle of the month. They have two days of village
46 seminars and then their annual meeting is that Saturday.
47 If we get too close to those dates, Vince, who is on the
48 Board, isn't going to be able to participate, so it puts
49 Richard and myself in a different position. Even the
50 12th and 13th.

00076

1 (Discussion held off record)

2

3 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: October 4th and 5th
4 in Cold Bay.

5

6 MR. SQUARTSOFF: Madame Chair. I'd like
7 to make a motion that we have our next meeting October
8 4th and 5th at King Cove with Cold Bay as backup.

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Pete
11 Squartsoff. Is there a second?

12

13 MR. ZACHAROF: Second.

14

15 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Richard
16 Zacharof. Discussion.

17

18 (No comments)

19

20 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: All in favor signify
21 by saying aye.

22

23 IN UNISON: Aye.

24

25 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

26

27 (No opposing votes)

28

29 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. I
30 do believe that takes care of all our business at this
31 point.

32

33 MR. FRIED: Madame Chair. Would you
34 reconfirm that the winter meeting is the 18th and 19th in
35 Larson Bay of March?

36

37 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Yes.

38

39 MR. FRIED: Thank you.

40

41 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Do I hear a motion
42 to adjourn?

43

44 MR. SQUARTSOFF: So move.

45

46 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion made by Peter
47 Squartsoff. Second.

48

49 MR. HOLMES: Second.

50

00077

1 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Second by Pat
2 Holmes. All in favor signify by saying aye.

3

4 IN UNISON: Aye.

5

6 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Opposed same sign.

7

8 (No opposing votes)

9

10 CHAIRWOMAN TRUMBLE: Motion carried. The
11 time is 5:00 o'clock and it's right on the nose.

12

13 (END OF PROCEEDINGS)

00078

1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2

3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

4)ss.

5 STATE OF ALASKA)

6

7 I, Joseph P. Kolasinski, Notary Public in and for
8 the state of Alaska and reporter of Computer Matrix Court
9 Reporters, LLC, do hereby certify:

10

11 THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 77
12 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the
13 KODIAK/ALEUTIANS FEDERAL SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL ADVISORY
14 COUNCIL MEETING, taken electronically by Computer Matrix
15 Court Reporters on the 17th day of October 2002,
16 beginning at the hour of 9:00 o'clock a.m. at the
17 Millenium Hotel, Anchorage, Alaska;

18

19 THAT the transcript is a true and correct
20 transcript requested to be transcribed and thereafter
21 transcribed by under my direction and reduced to print to
22 the best of our knowledge and ability;

23

24 THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party
25 interested in any way in this action.

26

27 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 2nd day of
28 November 2002.

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

Joseph P. Kolasinski
Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 4/17/04 □